

CIVIC CHRISTIANITY

BY

WILLIAM PRALL, S. T. D., PH. D.

RECTOR OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, DETROIT, MICH.



NEW-YORK

THOMAS WHITTAKER

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE

1895

MA

Copyright, 1895,
by
THOMAS WHITTAKER.

TO THE
REV. JAMES RANKINE, D.D.,
RECTOR OF THE DE LANCEY DIVINITY SCHOOL,
GENEVA, N. Y.,
THIS LITTLE BOOK IS DEDICATED WITH AFFECTIONATE REGARD.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PREFACE.

THE following sermons, with one exception, were written for and preached to my parishioners in St. John's Church, Detroit. Some of them have appeared in full or in part in the *Churchman*, in the *Detroit Free Press*, and in other journals. I have been asked so often for copies that I have determined to put the sermons in permanent shape and form. I do this for the gratification of my parishioners, and also with a hope that what I have said on the subjects treated may incite others to speak on them. At best I have only touched upon the hem of several things. There is much more that can much better be said on Civic Christianity. It does not seem to me that it is necessary to mention the sources whence I have gotten a phrase or an idea; nor is it possible to do so. As these sermons were prepared under constant pressure of the administration of a parish, and without thought, at the time of the preparation of the majority of them, of publication, the sources were

not noted. I wish, however, to make an acknowledgment to the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, of London, England, for some thoughts in my sermon "Christ and the Multitudes."

W. P.

ST. JOHN'S RECTORY, DETROIT,
January, 1895.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE MARKS OF THE MESSIAH.....	1
II. CHRIST AND THE MULTITUDES.....	20
III. THE ALIENATION OF THE MASSES	34
IV. THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG.....	49
V. THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND THE REFORMATION OF CRIMINALS	69
VI. "COMMON HONESTY".....	89
VII. THE SIN OF GOSSIP	106
VIII. GOOD CITIZENSHIP.....	120
IX. GOOD GOVERNMENT.....	137
X. THE SOCIAL EVIL AND THE LOW SALOON.....	157
XI. THE CROSS THE RESOLVENT OF DIFFICULTIES.....	178
XII. NO VISION, NO PEOPLE.....	192



I.

THE MARKS OF THE MESSIAH.*

“Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.”—MATT. xi. 4, 5.

THIS is the message that Jesus sent to John when the Baptist sent his disciples to inquire whether He were the Messiah or not. It seems strange, at first sight, that John should have made any inquiries of Jesus, in view of such proof as he had had that Jesus was indeed the Christ, the Son of God, on that day when Jesus came to be baptized of him in Jordan; yet a moment's reflection will show us that, simple as the Baptist was in his views of life, it would be but natural for him to expect another than Jesus to come. He would naturally, I say, associate the Messiah with the Israelitish dream of the Messianic kingdom. It is true of us all, we are

* Preached before the graduating class of Hobart College, 1892.

never far away from the thought of our times. John's question, too, was that which can always be asked—always, I mean, with propriety. It was the open question, "Art thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" It showed no prejudice.

And what were the proofs, the marks of the Messiah, to which Jesus pointed? What things, in other words, were they which distinguished the new from the old Adam? How simple they are! Not some vague portents, not some astounding wonders, not some esoteric doctrines, but what? Some simple acts of mercy: "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." These are all; and yet, simple as they are, what a difference do they mark between the old and the new way of living! How significant are they of the whole history of Christianity! The doing of good to poor, diseased humanity; the pointing to a life beyond the grave; the showing to the toiling, suffering poor that the good tidings of salvation are for them as well as for the handful of rich and powerful who usurped all the opportunities and possessions of life in

the ancient world—all this was to draw a line of demarcation between unregenerate and regenerate humanity, between the classical and Christian civilizations, as clear as the line of the equator is drawn. And mark, just as, although the line of the equator is drawn upon the earth, we pass insensibly from one hemisphere to the other, so do we pass imperceptibly from the old civilization into the new. It is only gradually that things change.

The answer of our Lord to the Baptist is twofold. He bids John's disciples tell him of His works and of His words; but His works and His words were directed to one single end: the doing of good to mankind, and especially to the unfortunate sons of men. Yet those who witnessed the things that Jesus spoke of, i.e., His works and His words of mercy, must have seen that His miraculous powers were circumscribed in this sphere of action. He did not make all the blind to see, all the deaf to hear, all the lame to walk, He did not cleanse all the lepers, He did not raise all the dead, He did not preach the gospel to all the poor: how can you account for this? Why, easily enough! Jesus did not come to do all the work of all humanity. He came to show man-

kind the way to do the works of man for men. He set us all our tasks to do. He started the world along the way of a better civilization, but He only started it.

Do you not perceive that what Christ did was to change the centre of ethics? Previous to His coming the centre of ethics had been self; he made it others. He sent self revolving around others; others should no more revolve around self. And just as when Copernicus discovered that the centre of our system is not the earth, but the sun, the earth did not stop, but went on its way rejoicing, so was it when Christ changed the centre of ethics. His followers have gone along their way—His way—but oh, what a change there has been in their conception of themselves, of others! It was but a simple thing that the Messiah did; yes, but see how far-reaching it is in its results; and it will reach ever farther and farther, like the change from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican system, down the avenues of time into eternity, unto God.

And so we perceive that Christ, when He died, finished His work, but He left work for all men to do—a work to humanize mankind; that would make it better, both actively and reflectively.

For this is the perfection of the work done for others: we help them, and we help ourselves in helping them; for we can do good to others only through our love for them; and the more we love them the more are we possessed of love; the more closely do we make ourselves resemble His image, in which we were created.

My friends, have you ever fully perceived the meaning of the summary that Christ made of the law and the prophets? I ask because I am only just beginning to realize its meaning myself. This summary that Christ made is as bold as it is transcendental. No mere human teacher would ever have ventured to reduce all religion to two simple statements; and especially would no mere human teacher have ventured to place man's duty to love and to serve his fellows on an equality with his duty to love and to serve his God. And yet this is just what Christ did in His words, even as He showed by His works. Aye, more; He, as the Son of God, showed men that the works of God are the works of man. Was He not both? He showed us that to love God was to love man.

Listen to a *résumé* of all the law and of all the prophets: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with

all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it (of like import), Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." You see, then, why it was that Jesus points out to John's disciples that the blind see, the deaf hear, the lepers are cleansed, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. It was necessary that men should see by Christ's example *who* their neighbors are; *how* it is that they should love them. You see it all ! The second Adam, the Messiah, showed John's disciples that his gospel was not something simply for the cultured and leisured—a philosophy, a theology—but that it was a way of life for men; the doing of acts of mercy to the unfortunate, the showing unto the poor of the world that God's love is over them equally, as man's love should go out to them.

We perceive, then, why it is that the gospel should be especially for the poor; but let us ask ourselves, What is poverty? I have in a measure answered the question; but I think we can give a technical answer by saying that poverty is deprivation, and that it is synonymous with human imperfection. Man, we must believe, when he was created in God's image, was made to be strong; but when sin came, and the seeds

of death through sin, he became weak. To a certain extent all men are poor, i.e., they are not as strong as they ought to be; but on this thought I do not wish to dwell. By the side of those whom, relatively, we call strong, there are the positively weak; and these, deprived as they are of their relative powers, are poor.

You perceive what I mean: it is the blind and the deaf and the lame and the diseased who are in the first instance poor; and these it is who, not being able to contend with the strong for the possessions of the earth, become poorer and poorer; who, unless they are relieved by the strong, sink at last into misery; "the destruction of the poor" becomes in very deed "their poverty."

Why, it is patent to all, the life of mankind on the earth is a life of struggle with nature. And this we perceive, not only when we look into God's written records, but when we look into the unwritten records of the rocks. "Replenish the earth, and subdue it," was God's first command to man. It is just in proportion as man subdues the earth and wrests from it its treasures, that he develops his strength, that he becomes civilized, that he secures the necessary

comforts of life. But all men are not equally fitted for a struggle with the earth; all men are not equally fitted for a struggle with one another; all have not the gift of acquisition, and many who have are too poor to obtain the opportunities of exercising this gift. The strong in body and in mind enter in, and they elbow out the weak. Aye, so greedy are they that they scarcely leave to the weak, the poor, the gleanings of the earth's fair fields. It is true they often consent, after they have obtained the lion's share of the good things of the world, to make some short division of their possessions to those who have not the gift of acquisition; but as a usual thing it is only to those who minister to their comforts or to their pride; it is rarely to the poor, except only in so far as the love of God and of man constrains them.

And note, it is precisely on this account that the laws of inheritance were made, i.e., that the strong made rules to protect inheritance. In case of their deaths, what would their weak women and children do if they had to struggle for existence? How soon would they be numbered among the poor! Now, there is enough of the good things of the earth for all, and more

than enough; but the strong take more than their share—aye, in many cases they take all—and the poor get only what is doled out to them, or what the state, with its stronger hand, forces the strong to give up by means of taxation. Do not think that this is exaggeration. Look into the history of the poor laws of England. We are apt to think that these laws were passed because of kindness, of charity; but the truth is, they were passed by the pressure of necessity. After the monasteries had been sequestered, and the common lands had been fenced in by the strong, the weak would have died of starvation unless these laws had been enacted. Aye, so greatly had the strong oppressed the weak that it was made a felony to appropriate the things that nature provided on the earth—the game and the fish. The gleaning of the fields was unheard of. The poor we shall always have with us, but surely there is no necessity for the abject poor.

O beloved! have you ever stopped to think what this word “poverty” means? I am not speaking now of the poverty of respectability—though that is hard enough to bear—but of the poverty of wasted life; of the failure of aspirations; of degradation. Do you ever think that

there are many who, weak in the power of acquisition by reason of some physical or mental infirmity, or weak through sickness or through another's misfortune, have often energies that might have been spent in making life beautiful, which must be exerted in making it barely supportable; many who have capacities for pleasure that would have sought rightful vent, which have often been turned into the ways of wantonness? I speak to you of want, of ignorance, of shame, of crime. God only knows the temptations of the poor.

And this—this state of affairs—seems to be a component part of our boasted nineteenth-century civilization. I was struck—and you cannot but be struck—with the recent encyclical of the Pope; and I quote his words, because the Pope, whatever may be the errors of the Roman Church, speaks for one half of Western Christendom:

“All agree—and there can be no question whatever—that some remedy must be found, and quickly found, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor. . . . By degrees it has come to pass that working-men have been given over, isolated and defenseless, to the cal-

lousness of employers and the greed of unrestrained competition. The evil has been increased by rapacious usury. . . . And to this must be added the custom of working by contract, and the concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals, so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

But what are we going to do about this state of affairs? We cannot cure it by making poor laws, we cannot regulate it by doling out food and clothing; these means have been tried, and have failed. Laws which would strike at the bottom of the evil would be of use if they could be put in force. The doling out of alms must be resorted to in especial cases; but what are we going to do about this state of affairs?

First, however, let me say that it would be impossible to understand Christ's work on earth unless we perceived that He came not to do all the work of humanity; unless we perceived that He came to show mankind what work it had to do. You see what is meant: Christ laid down general rules for the government of conduct; but these rules, though general, are applicable to each

individual man. It is for the individually strong men and women to act when there is wrong and injustice done. It is for them to help and protect the individually weak.

But mark, I do not mean that the individually strong men and women should merely seek out in the streets of their city some abject cases of poverty and care for them, but that they should have a care for all those with whom they come in daily contact. And if all the individually strong would do this the present state of affairs would speedily change. We would have the poor with us, but they would be only the poor of misfortune or of ineradicable wickedness. The misery which presses so heavily upon the masses of the poor would disappear like darkness at the approach of light.

But how are we to set to work to remedy this state of affairs? Well, in the first place, something can be done by legislation. Sanitary laws can be enacted and enforced; the relations of landlord and tenant can be revised and modified; the liquor traffic can be disciplined and regulated; speculation in food can be prohibited; traffic-rates can be equalized for all shippers; taxation can be imposed on the unearned in-

crement in lands—but all these things will be useless unless we get individual men and women to consent that they are right; unless we make them, as individuals, to endeavor to carry them into effect.

And thus we see that we must appeal to the individual conscience. You see what I mean: we must show men what it was that Christ did. We must show them how He helped the individuals who came to Him; how He changed the centre of ethics, and made others, not self, the pivot of His system—of that system which all men pronounce to be the greatest marvel of the life of the soul of man. And you will find that men will generally agree to this, i.e., that altruism and not egoism is the best rule of conduct. The trouble will be to get them to practise it as a rule, and not to regard it as a theory.

Ah! my friends, do you not see? Would to God that all men would see that there is in poverty an opportunity for the strong to do the work of regeneration; that the law of the new man is the law of help to men, even as it is the law of God! Christ showed us this, but He showed us more than this. He showed us that through the working out of this great law the strong get a

training in character that makes them like unto God! God does not care so much about speculations about Himself. It is good to have a liberal philosophy, a right theology; but our intellectual grasp of truth apart from the fact that God is, and that He is three Persons, has not much to do with the development of our higher life. What we should be is that which we become in the practical works of mercy toward our fellow-men.

Every institution that is founded to care for the unfortunate is the work of Christ. It is His gospel for the poor, preached practically. Homes, hospitals, asylums, reformatories—all are products of a Christian civilization. We must never forget that it was Christ's clergy who first established them. Though they have, many of them, been divorced from the Church, they flourish nowhere outside of the light of Christ; for all take their rise in the parable of the good Samaritan—in the life of Him who went about doing good.

But these things are not sufficient. After all, those who give to these institutions are but few in number; nor can the gifts of money compare with the gift of service. Do we not perceive this

in Christ? Indeed, many there are who give money to purchase from their consciences an immunity from service. When will the strong learn that it is

“Not what we give, but what we share—
For the gift without the giver is bare—”

that has stamped upon it the marks of the Messiah, that is the only coin which will pass current in His kingdom?

You see what I mean: you must take a real, an active interest in the poor. You must make them to feel that you do not treat them from an arm's length; that you do not regard them as inferiors, as recipients merely of your discarded clothing and surplus wealth. Do not misunderstand me; I have the greatest admiration for those who give willingly, for those who regard their wealth as a bounty of God, and themselves as His stewards; but I say frankly, as I understand the marks of the Messiah, to give money alone is not sufficient; it does not fill out the full measure of the royal law.

My friends, do you not read the signs of the times? On all sides the toiling, struggling poor make demands that the political economists, when they settled their theory of capital, labor,

and the wage fund, never dreamed of. Who will say that the poor have not a right to the things that they declare are necessary in order that they may develop like men? Who is there that does not hope that they may be advanced all along the line of comfort, of culture, of Christianity? And the advance will come—it must come; but how? Surely not by the adoption of any radical program such as that of Karl Marx, nor by the unfolding of any pusillanimous Utopia such as that of Edward Bellamy; but by the new regeneration of the mass of the weak individual men and women, through the personal help of the strong, through the preaching of the gospel by deed as well as by word. Society cannot be remodeled by laws, unless, indeed, the laws are written in the hearts of men. The laws of Moses never really directed the actions of the Israelites; they were external to them and were written upon stones. But the rules of Christ can direct our actions, because they are internal to us and are written upon our hearts, i.e., they are written there if we honor and love Him as God and as Man.

As Christian men, then, take hold of the real questions of the day—the social questions; a

hundred demand solution. They meet our eyes in every newspaper, in every magazine. They cry out to us from every mill and tenement and saloon. There is the question of the rescue of young children from premature toil and degrading surroundings. There is the question of their education, physical, intellectual, moral, and religious. There is the question of the suppression of the social vices of intemperance, gambling, vagrancy, and another that need not be named. There is the question of the relief of the unemployed and of the scantily paid employed. There is the whole great question of capital and labor, interest and wages. There is a series of questions concerning the sanitary conditions of tenements, of workshops; of the securing of Sunday and of shorter hours of labor to the poor. Then there is a whole series of questions concerning the reform of the primary meeting, of the caucus, the ballot; the suppression of bribery; the securing of a good civil service and a fair judiciary. And there are those most interesting and pressing questions of the prevention of crime and the reformation of criminals. To these I might add others—for example, the treatment of the insane, an equitable mode of taxation, the re-

•

striction of immigration, and the like—but I forbear.

And these questions demand solution; and for their solution they demand study, devotion, and service more than they do money. And they demand these things, not so much in theory (though theorizing is good in its way), but in action. The questions demand that the individually strong should do as Christ did—do the works of mercy for the individually poor of the world.

And now a word of advice, of counsel, to you, gentlemen of the graduating class of 1892—to you who are about to begin the active work of your lives. Remember that life is understood only as you make others and not yourselves the centre of your thoughts and deeds, even as it is impossible to understand the universe through the Ptolemaic, but only through the Copernican, system; and every human soul is a microcosm, reflecting the macrocosm. If you will do this your lives (no matter what may be the amount of success that the world will accord or withhold from you) will be full and beautiful; for you will be in the guidance of the new Adam, and not under the law of the old. And in His guidance

you will attain unto something of the perfection that all men recognize to be His.

But more than this: you will do much of the work of humanity that remains to be done for men. You will help to raise the tone of all society. You will alleviate many of the dreadful sufferings of mankind. You will become good citizens—good Christians; you will be men.

II.

CHRIST AND THE MULTITUDES.

“But when He saw the multitudes, He was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. Then saith He unto His disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.”—MATT. ix. 36, 37.

THE subject of my discourse to-day is Jesus Christ and the multitudes. How did Jesus, in His walks through the cities of Judah and Galilee, act toward the multitudes—the masses of men? Let it be understood, first of all, that Jesus Christ was Himself what is called a man of the people—a working-man. It must not be understood thereby that He was boorish and uneducated. (It is not necessary to think that any working-man is.) The Jews ever gave great attention to the education of the young. At an early age Jesus was found in the temple holding His own with the doctors of the law. We should understand by “working-man” that the occupation of Jesus was that of a man who gains his

livelihood by the use of his hands; that He was by trade a carpenter. But we should understand more: we should understand that Jesus lived always with and among the people; that He spent His life chiefly in a crowd, near to the men and women of lowly degree. Again and again do we read that the people "pressed upon Him for to touch Him." We are told that "the common people heard Him gladly." We are asked, "Hath any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?" He Himself spoke of the fact of His preaching the gospel to the poor as one of the great proofs of His Messiahship.

And so we read in the words of our text that "when Jesus saw the multitudes, He was moved with compassion on them." Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that whenever Jesus came into contact with the multitudes—face to face, as it were, with them—He "had compassion on them." It grieved Him then (it must grieve Him now) to see how much they were left to themselves; how much they were scattered abroad; how out of all touch with the higher classes they were; how out of all the calculation of the aristocracy of the nation. "They were like sheep having no shepherd." They were ready for the

harvesting into the garner, the Church, but there were no harvesters.

My friends, never in the history of the Church has there been so great and splendid a promise of a plenteous harvest of the multitudes as there is to-day. Never has the demand been so great for laborers for the harvest. The people—the fourth estate, as they were called by the old French economists—have now become the first in power in all the enlightened countries of the world. That power, indeed, which was once lodged in a feudal nobility, and which from the nobility passed to the great middle classes, has at last, in the evolution of democracy, come into the hands of the working masses. Democracy is triumphant in America, in Australia, in France. It is making itself to be heard in Germany and in the British Isles. Like a strong giant, the people have aroused themselves from sleep; they will be heard; and who shall withstand the cry of their voice? Labor, its rights and its wrongs, labor associations and labor parties, meet our eyes and claim our ears in all the publications, from all the platforms of the day. It is true that labor has met with many and sad reverses in its efforts toward emancipation and success;

but these reverses have taught the working-class wholesome lessons, by means of which they have profited so well that, firm, determined, confident, they make their rightful claims to a larger share in the marvelous productions of the age, and no one dare say them nay. It is remarkable with what dignity, sobriety, and fairness the delegates of the labor associations and of the trades-unions discuss their questions in all their conventions, here and abroad. But still more remarkable is the calmness and reasonableness of the newspapers which discuss these labor gatherings. The world is advancing: labor no more looks upon capital as an enemy in itself; capital sees that labor cannot and does not want it destroyed. We all see that what the masses want is an advance in culture, in education, in the benefits of this most productive age; and we are, most of us, willing that they should have this advance, for we recognize the justice of it.

But the question is, How are we going to act toward this new power—this new demand? For there is no use hiding it from ourselves: socialism in some form or other has come to stay. It has challenged and it has secured the support of all the great publicists and thinkers of the age.

•

Associations have been formed, or are in the process of formation, on all sides to discuss this great movement, to formulate it, to put its practicable demands in the way of being acted upon. There will not be, in all probability, a general union of production by the means which socialists call "collective capital," nor will all rents and interests be abolished; but the avenues of trade and the great raw staples of food and material will eventually be controlled, if not owned, by the nation. Labor shall no more envy capital and capital shall no more vex labor. There shall come a time in the Church of God when he that doth not work—or hath not worked—shall not eat! For God is a worker, and the Son of God and of man is a worker; who hath a right to live in idleness?

Do you not see—oh that the working-class might see!—that Jesus Christ is the best friend that they ever had? We of the privileged class may seem to forget this as much as we will, yet there is ever a conscious feeling in our hearts that Jesus was a carpenter, a man of the people; that He was "moved with compassion" when He came face to face with them. And so when the masses make demands upon us that we

should give up some of our cherished privileges, and reproach us with the fact that though we profess to be like Christ we are utterly unlike Him, we yield; we yield with unwilling hearts, it is true, but we yield—we are yielding. My friends, you do not read at all the signs of the times if you do not see the immense strides that the working-men have made—are making—in power, in position, in dignity.

And it is just herein that there lies the difference between us and the classical world. The old civilization, with all of its culture and refinement, failed in this and because of this: that its politicians and thinkers had no compassion on the multitudes. Athens was a democracy of aristocracy; the whole fabric of the state rested on a mass of struggling, toiling men and women who were bound in chains of slavery. The policy of the Romans was either to flatter and bribe the masses, or else to betray and kill them. Paganism, tied up as it was with slavery, could offer no better way to deal with the multitudes. Let me say right here—and I speak out of the experience of two professions—that the best excuse that public men—aye, and private men too—have for their distrust and fear of the common

people is that they do not know them. Indeed, this is, as I take it, the great calamity of the age: the people of wealth and refinement come too little in contact, in touch, with the people of labor and lowly degree. Why, humanity is humanity, and there is but little difference between men and men, or between women and women, wherever you may find them, in whatsoever walks of life. The words of Shylock in the play come to my mind. He speaks of himself as a Jew. Let us speak as he speaks of every and any man:

“Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer, as a Christian is? If you prick us, do we not bleed? if you tickle us, do we not laugh? if you poison us, do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that.” Alas! alas! too often has it been so!

There is but little difference, I repeat, between “all sorts and conditions of men,” and though wealth may have made a gulf of feeling between the higher and lower classes, the step between

them in this life is a little one in fact, and is often made in a few short years. Indeed, it is just herein that we see the hollowness of the whole thing. And this, as I have already said, is a great calamity : the feeling of pride and vainglory keeps the higher classes away from the masses ; they know little about them, and, as a rule, they do not want to know anything more. You may say that my indictment is too sweeping ; well, how many of the common people do you, do each of you, know ? How many have you ever called upon ? I do not mean how many have you ever visited to give them money and old clothes, but how many have you ever called upon in a neighborly, Christlike way ? Not very many, I imagine. Each section of society in the United States desires to keep away from every other section ; so all the joints of the social fabric are open ; when the winds and the floods come, great will be the destruction and the fall thereof.

But how is it with the employers of labor ? Do they come into touch with their workmen ? No, not at all. There was a time in the New England and in the other villages of the land when the employer knew all his "hands" by

name and had a knowledge of their welfare; but the mills have grown to such colossal proportions that the master now seems to know none. The men come into contact with their employers on Saturday night when they receive their weekly wages through the window in the office, and this is generally all. No wonder there is often anger and suspicion between the one and the other.

The classes do not know the masses, nor do the masses know the classes. They do not know how many men there are among the rich and the powerful who regret the present state of affairs; who long to modify, if not to remedy, it. And so it is that employers have erected libraries, started insurance organizations, established infirmaries, etc. But all these things are but makeshifts; they do not stop the gap; they but bridge it over here and there. The masses will never be contented until they come into actual touch with their brothers of the classes. They know that they are, many of them, brutalized by constant labor, given over to drink and to unholy ways of living; they want to get out of such ways; they want to walk in the light of the life which they see, or think that they see,

in the paths of the cultured people. All men must have teachers: "the common people heard Christ gladly;" they would hear us—they would gladly hear us too—if we were more like Him whom we profess to be our Master.

And we in our pride and selfishness, given over to covetousness and vainglory—surely they could teach us, too, many a lesson of humility and generosity, of contempt for riches and the chief places, if we would but know them. They could show us daily examples of Christ's doctrine that "a man's life doth not consist in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

Mix, then, with the people; learn to love them and they will learn to love you. If you are a man and not a conventionality, you will find humanity—all that is best and excellent in humanity—under every roof. And this finding of humanity will make you ashamed of your pride and vainglory, and you will come out of your mixing with the people with an enthusiasm that will make your heart to swell and you yourself to thank God that you too are a man. You will have the joy that Jesus had when He healed the multitudes, when He fed them, when He preached the gospel to the poor. But when you

mix with the multitudes do not act as if you were a superior being, even though you may be a messenger of God to them. Be not aware of yourself at all; or, if you be aware of yourself, think only that, but for the grace of God toward you, you might have been occupying the lowly place in the social scale that so many of your brothers and sisters occupy.

One of the most striking features of the age is the coming together of people in especial places—the great growth of cities. Here, huddled and massed together on insufficient ground, the masses are neglected; they pay more rent per square foot in their squalor than the wealthiest citizens do in their glory; and it is the rent that presses so heavily on the poor. Harassed by incessant noise, bad air, and sickness, no wonder they have not fine manners. Anxious by reason of want of work, no wonder they just maintain their heads above water. You may say that the poor are improvident, but so are we all. It is the exceptional man who secures and keeps secure a competence—who insures the well-being of his family after death. But it is difficult for the masses to be provident; their wages are not great, their work is often uncertain, their rents

are high, and so much of their savings must go to eke out an existence in the "bad times," so much is swallowed up in sickness, that it is almost impossible for them to be provident, unless they are exceptionally fortunate. I have had case after case of distress come to me where sickness, and not improvidence, was its cause. Sickness leads to borrowing, and borrowing makes people to go to the usurers, and these speedily sap all the strength out of the households of the self-respecting, and reduce them to the condition of the helpless poor.

And then there is that miserable, mean way that the "harpies" have of selling a piece of furniture or a sewing-machine on instalments, the payment of the instalment to depend upon the continuous wages of the head of the house. Alas! how often is there a strike or a panic or some accident or sickness, and the instalment is not forthcoming, and so the "harpy" enters in and takes away the article, and keeps also the money that has already been paid, in forfeiture! Oh, the wretched men who "grind the faces of the poor"; who take from them cent per cent of usury of all that they lend them! Surely God shall render to them some day the measure that

they have meted. Surely He will not hold us guiltless who suffer such things to be. And how ignorant, how helpless are the people who get into the clutches of these wretches, who, knowing the law and of the ways of the law, spread their traps for them, covering up all their devices! How can we blame the poor if they lose courage, and, feeling in the bitterness of their souls that their brothers have no care for them, end by caring neither for man nor God?

But of poverty in itself I have not wished to speak so much to-day; I wanted rather to draw your attention to the great danger that there is of a permanent misunderstanding between the classes and the masses, and to point out to you your duty as Christian men and women toward this state of affairs. If each of you should ask me, "What is my duty?" I must confess I could not answer you in any detail; but what I can and what I do advise you to do is to put yourself in the place of Christ toward the "multitudes" of your fellow-men. You profess that you believe that He is the Word, and that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us"; believe, then, in the truth of the Incarnation truly: that the Word dwells in the flesh of all.

men; that all men, therefore, are equal in the sight of God; that with Him there is no respect of persons, that with us there should be none. It all depends—the whole of our conduct toward the multitudes depends—upon this question: Are we occupying the position of Christ or not? And if we are we will do our duty without delay; we will have no need of words of exhortation, no need of the reports of commissions, no need of charity organizations, but we will mingle with the masses as men with men, and the occasion as it arises will show us what to do, and we will do what the occasion requires, if we love Jesus Christ our Lord. For

“ . . . dearly, dearly hath He loved,
And we must love Him too,
And trust in His redeeming blood,
And try His work to do.”

III.

THE ALIENATION OF THE MASSES.

“And the people sought Him, and came unto Him, and stayed Him, that He should not depart from them.”—LUKE iv. 42.

If there is any one fact that is apparent in these days of the end of the nineteenth century in regard to the state of our religion, it is that the masses are not in the churches; that they seem to be, if they are not actually, alienated therefrom.

Run your eye along Woodward Avenue and count the churches thereupon, and you must see what I mean. The costliest, handsomest churches in Detroit are spread out along this great thoroughfare, or they are not far from it—in the parts of the city inhabited chiefly by the rich. Of course you can find in the territory to the right and to the left many church-buildings; but the chief ones are, as I have said, to be found on Woodward Avenue or on Jefferson Avenue or on Fort Street, or in their immediate vicinities, in the quarters of the rich.

Now I do not mean to say that these churches of the wealthy and cultured classes do not minister to the lowly and simple people; on the contrary, they do so in many ways, and in their membership many plain and unpretentious citizens are to be found. But for the most part they minister to the rich; do you not find this to be so?

The mechanics and laboring classes in the United States do not go often to church, except as they go to the Roman Catholic or to some of the Episcopal churches in the largest cities. Even the Methodist denomination, which once held so many of them in its wide embrace, has in some ways latterly lost its hold upon their affections. The Salvation Army has tried to take its place, but it has not altogether succeeded. As I know the plainer classes of men, I know that they do not care for the sort of Christianity which is propagated by the aid of tambourines and cornets and the rest. But let me say in passing, the Salvationists, I am sure, do much good in arresting the attention of men to the essential truths of Christianity. I know that in the great cities like London and New York the churches have sent their missionaries,

clerical and lay, into the mean and squalid quarters of the poorest of men, and that they have done much good by such agencies as a "Toynbee Hall" and an "Oxford House" and an "East Side House" and a "College Settlement"; but, after all, these agencies have not brought back the masses into the fold of the churches; rather have they served to illustrate the truth that the lowest classes are not in them. But I do not so much, to-day, speak of these "sorts and conditions" of men as of the operatives and mechanics.

Now there are two questions which arise in our minds as we are confronted by this state of affairs: first, How do we account for it? secondly, What is to be done to remedy it?

Let us examine the reasons why this state of affairs has come to pass. My belief is that it is caused primarily by the alienation of the so-called higher from the lower classes outside of the churches, which is continued inside of them. As a matter of fact, the separation of these two classes of people has become so great that there is no intercourse to-day between master and servant, employer and employee. There was a time when the employer was but little removed from

his employees, and lived among them, knowing most of them personally, able to call them by their names. But it is not so now. The master in the great business concerns knows none of his servants, or, if he knows them, he knows them simply as so many "hands" which are adjusted to his machines. He lives, usually, far removed from them. And besides, most of the masters to-day are great corporations, of which the stock is owned by a number of irresponsible (so far as the operatives are concerned) persons, who care only for dividends. And these stockholders live anywhere and everywhere, wherever their surroundings are most pleasant to themselves. They are often utter strangers to all the rest of those who are interested in the concern, as well to other stockholders as to operatives and mechanics.

Now it is the employer classes—the rich—rather than the employees—the poor—who build churches; and they build them for themselves, in the parts of the cities where they dwell. I will do them justice: they often desire that the masses shall come to their churches (though sometimes they do not even desire this); but it is not to be supposed that they will. Separated

as the two classes are on week-days in the actual affairs of life, it is a logical outcome of this fact that they will not come together on Sundays. I am speaking now generally to men and women who do not belong to the operative class. Put the question to yourselves: If you should have no intercourse with your richer neighbors during the week would you feel like going to their places of worship for an hour or two on Sundays? "Ah yes! but," you will say, "if you feel this way, why do you not build churches and maintain them for yourselves?" The answer is obvious: "It costs money—a great deal of money—to build and to maintain churches; we really cannot afford to do this. Even with the rich the churches depend upon the few most wealthy and generous to save them from bankruptcy." "True," you will say, "but we furnish you with mission chapels." "True, you do; but they are evidences that you, on your part, do not really expect us to come to your churches. And these chapels? Well, sometimes we have well-ordered services and sermons that edify, but for the most part of the time we do not. In religious affairs we will be content only with the best."

Nor is this the only reason why the masses

are alienated from the churches; there is a reason far more subtle and pernicious to the cause of Christ. It is the division of Christendom into so many denominations and sects. The minds of the working-people, as a rule, are not prone to fine and fine-spun distinctions. Occupied as they are with earning their daily bread, they have no time to make historical and philosophical studies. They cannot help but ask themselves why there are so many denominations bidding for their good will and support. Perhaps they can understand the distinction between the papacy and the Protestant churches, but outside of this I do not believe that there is one in a thousand who knows the reason for the Episcopal or the Presbyterian or the Methodist Church. They say to the educated classes: "You monopolize the churches. Heal your divisions, and then come to us and we will hear you. If you each think that your own way of living Christ's life is the best way, that your own way of thinking about God is the right way, what is the use of our bothering? You all cannot be right—you may all be wrong." And, let us confess it, there is a great deal in this logic of the working populace to make us pause.

You will notice that I have spoken of the alienation of the masses from the churches, and not from Christianity; and I have done this intentionally, for Christianity and the churches are not identical. Christianity is the subject-matter of the churches' teachings, and the reason for their existence; but Christianity is bigger and broader and better than any church or than all the churches together. One of the greatest evils of the world is that one or another of the churches has tried to monopolize Christianity and to make it identical with itself; but the doctrines of Christ have burst their bounds as perennially as the waters flow forth out of our Great Lakes. If all the churches on the face of the earth were one, Christianity might be said to be identical with it, but not of necessity. If that one church should err in any way it would fall short of the doctrine of our Lord, and be less than His Church.

The masses are not, I believe, alienated from Christianity. Here and there there are groups of men who, identifying Christianity with the churches, and feeling themselves antagonistic to them, aver that they are agnostics, atheists, infidels, anarchists, or what you will. These men,

for the most part, are few. The vast majority of the masses turn to Christ, and come to Him and stay upon Him, and so they will do to the end of time. They recognize Him to have been a working-man, as they are themselves; a man acquainted with grief, as they know they must be; a man upon whom the burden of life pressed with terrific force. It is not the Christ of the evangelists that they cannot love, the Christ who came preaching the "gospel to the poor," whom the common people heard gladly; but it is the Christ of the churches, whom theology and philosophy have explained away from the ordinary affairs of life and made a mere abstraction; whom ecclesiasticism and traditionalism have made a sort of show-figure, stiff with jewels and embroidery. The common people will hear Christ to-day as gladly as they did when He was here on earth, when His preachers come to them, as He came, in lowliness and in simplicity; when His confessors live, as He told them to live, in meekness and in mercy; when we who are Christians cease to be hypocrites, deceiving ourselves and seeking to deceive others.

And this we will cease to be when we give up our idols of wealth and of success and of plea-

sure, and live as Christ lived on earth; offering "ourselves—our souls and bodies—to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice" to God and man for the sake of Christ, who saved us and all mankind from the doom of sin. It was said that the Roman augurs, when they examined the entrails of birds to find some omen for doing or not doing something, laughed one another in the face. Frankly, I wonder that we who profess and call ourselves Christians do not often do the same. The fact is that our whole system of living is wrong. We build houses and set up our domestic establishments with a single eye to our own comfort and pleasure, and then we give what is left over—if anything is left—of our time and service and money to our neighbors; whereas we ought to build our houses and regulate our lives from the beginning with two eyes—one directed to ourselves and our families, and one to our neighbors and theirs; and our time and service and money should be divided into two equal parts. By the term "neighbor" here I mean all the interests that are not our especial interests: the city, the State, and the affairs of men generally—religious, moral, intellectual, social. I ask you, Would it not be a nobler way

of living? Would not men—all men—be happier? Would not all the divisions of Christendom, social, political, and ecclesiastical, be shortly put in the way of being healed?

And this brings me to the point. The unity of Christendom should not be simply a unity of feeling, but a unity in fact. We must have feeling to lead to a union between the churches, but this feeling is not the fact itself. Indeed, there is, as there has always been, a sort of unity in Christendom—a unity which has existed in spite of schisms; a unity of feeling which is founded in a common belief in Christ rather than in Buddha or in Mohammed. And this unity is real. It is what is called Christian unity apart from church unity. And this unity of feeling has been the safeguard of Christendom. It is manifest in the family, on the street, on the platform, in all the daily concerns of life. The leaders of Christian thought and practice, no matter to what especial church or denomination they may belong, are all animated by the conviction that Christian morality and belief must be maintained. But with this unity the masses are not content. As they have not much time to think, and to arrange the picture-puzzle that

has been disarranged by profane hands, they become impatient with all the blocks, and ask that they may be destroyed. These blocks have become veritable stumbling-blocks in their way. Again, the masses have (since the demos has become the ruling power) but little patience with historical *impedimenta*. Good illustrations of this impatience are seen in the opposition of the people to the House of Lords in Great Britain and to the Senate in the United States, both of which, as at present constituted, have become obsolete, and will have to "go by the board."

So in the churches the masses care nothing for the old quarrels which started the Presbyterians off at a tangent at Westminster, or made the Independents to come to New England to set up their shibboleths. They know that a bishop to-day is not a bugaboo, and they know, too, that he has not, as he ought not to have, any power in civil affairs but that which comes of influence and persuasion to good. On the other hand, they know that the Prayer-book is only good for something as it expresses the hearty desires and aspirations of the people now, and that it is nonsense to make its use obligatory at all times,

upon all classes and conditions of men. And so of vested choirs and all other ritual observances of whatsoever kind: they are not of the essence of things, and should not be imposed upon people as divine because they were used in the early or in the medieval church. I do not believe that the masses have lost respect and veneration for the ordinances established by the Son of God and of man. He is, as He has always manifested Himself to be, the friend of the people. They feel that He desires to wash away the sins of the lowliest, that He wills to give His Body and Blood to the poorest. Their great fear is that the professed followers of Christ are not as generous-minded as their Master.

Again, if there were a church unity the masses feel that there would be churches built for the masses; that they would not be planted generally in the best quarters of the town, neither would they have the air of "clubs." The American people especially want to feel that the things they use belong to them. I am convinced that a great central church, built on a site where people most do congregate, with wide-open doors and daily prayers, with a large seating-space, yet with broad aisles, free to all, would, if built

by Christians of all churches and denominations, and maintained by them with dignity and order, have more to do with reconciling the masses to the Church of Christ than any one other thing—than many days passed in the discussion of differences, than many hundredweights of published arguments, advocating divers overtures and platforms. It would be a visible presentation of the fact of unity. And in this great church the preaching should be done by the best men of all kinds and orders, clerical and lay, who are believers in the divinity of Christ.

Ah! my friends, you will say I have pictured for you an ideal; yet surely not an ideal that cannot be realized. If you have the will to help, if others will have a like will, this ideal could be put into shape and form in a few short years. Think of the wonderful ideal of the people's aspirations toward beauty and utility that was presented in the "White City"; and though it has passed away like the great walls and towers of some mighty city of the clouds, it yet remains a fact in the memory of men. But the ideal of which I have spoken—the ideal of spirituality and religion—is not to be built in lath and plaster, but in iron and stone; and it is to

stand as a common House of the hearts and souls of men forever, the witness of our united belief in our one common Master, Jesus the Christ.

And some such thing as this, my friends, must be done. The classes must be united, even as the separated sects of the Church of Christ must be. Humanity is on its last great trial. One by one it has called forth its reserve forces. First it was the king, then the aristocracy, then the middle classes, that held the reins of power. Now the masses rule. Christianity is the veritable salt and light of the world; without it there could have been no moral development of civilization, perhaps no development at all. With the loss of it humanity will retrograde and fall back into barbarism. It was the lack of moral standards that was the cause of the disintegration of the ancient empires of the world. We have therefore a duty to perform. We must bring the masses back into the churches—into the Church of Christ; for the Church, and nothing less, is the teacher of the doctrines of our Lord. It is to it, and to nothing less, that He has given power to conquer the evils of the world.

And we can bring the masses into the Church,

I am sure, if we will do two things—namely, close up the gap between the classes and the masses, and unite the dissevered sects of Christendom. The work is herculean, but by God's help it cannot fail. Our Lord Himself has said that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church; much less, then, shall the weakness and wickedness of men.

IV.

THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG.

“The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.”—ISA. xi. 6.

THERE is a passage in Professor Drummond’s “Ascent of Man” which is so expressive of the power and value of childhood that I could not but consider it to be inspired were it not that he evidently had in mind, when he wrote it, the prophecy that I have quoted from the Book of Isaiah. It reads: “Love, then, is no necessary ingredient of the sex relation; it is not the out-growth of passion. Love is love, and has always been love, and has never been anything lower. Whence, then, came it? If neither the husband nor the wife bestowed this gift upon the world, who did? It was a little child. Till this appeared man’s affection was non-existent, woman’s was frozen. The man did not love the woman, the woman did not love the man. But one day

from its mother's very heart, from a shrine which her husband never visited nor knew was there, which she herself dared scarce acknowledge, a child drew forth the first fresh bud of a love which was not passion, a love which was not selfish, a love which was an incense from its Maker, and whose fragrance from that hour went forth to sanctify the world."

And this statement experience confirms. All experience, I say, confirms the fact that the little child is the great embodiment of the *summum bonum* of the world; that it is the chief means of its propagation; that it is the best way for the exercise of its power. I have not time, with the objective points I have in mind, to show you how necessary it was that love in its fullness should come into the world as a little child; how imperative it was that that child should be born of a virgin without taint of passion. I have done this on another occasion.

First, I desire to draw your attention to the fact that childhood is the glory of Christendom; that it alone has made peace between the conflicting feelings and interests of men; that it alone has modified and softened the harshness of the hearts of our rough progenitors, as they

perceived in each child the image of God, who was made flesh, and who came as a little child into the world.

Secondly, I desire to show you how great is the obligation that rests upon us to protect and educate little children. That this obligation is a primary one we have always known; but I think we have never appreciated the magnitude of it until we learned to see that childhood is the flower of our race, and, since Christ was born, that the education of children is the distinguishing mark of civilization.

Thirdly, and chiefly, I desire to study with you the best ways of protecting and educating little children. But before proceeding to a particular examination of the best ways and methods of protecting and educating children, let me call your attention to the two great laws which govern all growth, and especially the growth of the life of mankind; namely, the law of heredity and the law of environment. Among all the laws that have come into prominence during the past half-century, none is more important than that of heredity. It was, to be sure, recognized as a factor in the life of men in all ages; but just to what degree it was a factor was never

ascertained until recently. It was strange, too, that no one thought of examining the law of heredity scientifically. Many of the Greek tragedies were founded upon it, and it was promulgated with terrific emphasis from Sinai in the second commandment of God: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep My commandments." It is evolution that has brought the law of heredity into so great prominence; for evolution works by two factors, namely, by heredity—by the things which tend to permanence—and by environment—by the things which conduce to variation. The characteristic of heredity may be stated in this way: that it produces the past; the characteristic of environment, that it adapts the past to new conditions.

Now the question arises, Is heredity an irresistible force? Must that which is potential in life manifest itself? And we answer, No, not always; the traits that are hereditary can always be modified; they can often be changed. But there are certain general physical and mental

traits which cannot be changed. For example, a negro will always be a negro, but a Hottentot may be a savage or a Christian gentleman; and the means of modifying his traits is environment or education. It has been supposed until recently that heredity is always a stronger factor than environment; and this was supposed because, within the limitations I have noted, heredity is the stronger, and therefore appeared to be always dominant; but closer examination of the phenomena of life has shown that, outside of these limitations, environment is the stronger. Had it not been so there could have been no progress; and progress is the way, the mode of life, of the world.

Man is a creature of mixed natural biases; there are in him things which tend to good and things which tend to evil. The law of heredity, as science interprets it, avers that there is a tendency in the evil as well as in the good to perpetuate itself; and so the great question arises, Can hereditary good be protected and preserved, and hereditary evil be modified and changed? Let us look at some of the evidence on this question. Dugdale, who has written a history of the Jukes family—a family of criminals of

several generations—says that “when the organization is not structurally modified (as in idiocy or insanity) or organically weak, and where conduct depends on knowledge of moral obligation, environment is stronger than heredity.” And to the same effect spoke Mr. William M. F. Round in the *Forum* for September, 1893. “I have,” says he, “seen repeatedly the most virtuous children of the most vicious parents; and, on the other hand, I have known the children of the most virtuous parents to turn out the most hardened criminals and the most troublesome social subjects to deal with. . . . Physical conditions likely to promote criminality aside, I believe that the child of the thief, apart from his environment and possible training, starts well-nigh as fairly in the race of life as the child of the average citizen. It is environment and training, not heredity, that give the most favorable condition for the development of the criminal impulse.”

And if for the development of the criminal impulse, why not for the moral? And this testimony of Dugdale and of Round is confirmed by experience. The Elmira Reformatory was established in New York State some eighteen years ago, to take charge of the boys and young men

who were adjudged to be bad. Its reports show that more than eighty percent. of the young men who were turned out, after an education in things mental, moral, and physical, have become good. And to the same effect is the testimony of the Christian Brothers of Manchester, who have taken upon themselves to reform the street Arabs of that great manufacturing city. They gather up the young, then they form them into boys' brigades, and then they put them in their reformatories and educate them. And they report that eighty-seven percent. of these poor, degraded children have been reformed and made into useful, respectable men. And who will tell of the loving labors of the late Charles Loring Brace, of New York, and of good Dr. Barnardo, of London, in rescuing the waifs and strays of these great cities from sin and sickness, and reforming them into the images of God!

But I did not desire to speak upon this, the reforming side of education. I have brought these facts to your minds so that you could see and know its mighty, godlike power. I wish to speak with you upon the best ways and methods of protecting and educating children in general. But before doing this, let me make a *résumé* of

what I have already said: that the little child is the greatest thing in the world, and that though heredity counts for much in its life, outside of certain traits, education is stronger than it. It is not necessary, I am sure, to point out that the proper time for education is during childhood.

I cannot enter upon a thorough discussion of all the ways and methods of education; I have not the time. I have only time to point out to you the lines that it should follow. And it is these lines that we should get into our minds; for if we do so, all other things as to ways and methods will fall logically into their places in a natural sequence. There is in a child a body and there is a mind, and there are also moral possibilities and religious aspirations. The body and the mind are self-evident; moral possibilities and religious aspirations are evident only because we have discovered them in ourselves and have heard of them in others. The intellectual apparatus—the mind—of the child has for many generations received great attention; its moral nature has received some, and so have its religious aspirations; but its physical framework has been completely ignored. Let us look first at this. But before so doing, let me speak to

you of the horror of our modern industrial system; of the employment (I ought to say enslavement) of children in our great stores and factories. When we think of the health and preservation of society alone we ought to declare that such a thing ought not to be; and when we think of the dignity and worth of childhood itself we ought to determine that such a thing shall not be. How can the boys and the girls who are set to work at a tender age learn to become and to be intelligent members of the great American commonwealth? How can they become the strong fathers and mothers of virile offspring? The ignorance and the sickliness of the poor children who grow up in shops and mills and mines are proverbial; and to know that little children who ought to be free to enjoy the bounty of our, and their, Father in heaven are shut up in some big, grimy, oily mill, or poked down in some deep, dark, dingy mine, is enough to make the heart sick.

I know that it is said (and the saying is, alas! often true) that it is necessary at times that children should work, to support their invalided fathers and widowed mothers; but it ought not to be necessary; society should find some other

way to relieve misfortune—some way of insurance and the like. All the world agrees that part of “pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction”; it agrees to this, at least in theory. It needs but the strong determination of some big-hearted men to make the theory a reality. Anyway, no girl under sixteen and no boy under fifteen should be permitted to work for daily wages. Child labor should be abolished in favor of child education. And at whatever age the young begin to work, it should be always under certain limitations and restrictions.

It seems strange that so little has been done to teach the child how to use its bodily frame. For the body of the man, if we may trust the conclusion of the scientific philosophers, is one of the great terminal points in the evolution of nature—one, that is, of its greatest works; yet we, for the most part, regard the body as a mere case for the mind. That it is something far greater it is not necessary to set forth by anatomical detail. Surely if it were not the greatest work of nature the Word of God would never have been made flesh and dwelt among

us! And see how the Word treated the body—that is, how He educated it. It is a simple story, simply told. “Is not,” it was asked of Him—“is not this the carpenter?” “Is not this the carpenter’s son?” Jesus Christ learned a trade; He learned to use His hands, the most wonderful pieces of mechanism known to all creation; the things that distinguish man above all other forms of life, backed as he is by the mighty brain.

But what do we do for our children? Do we teach them how to use their hands—how to work at a trade? Not often; we teach the girl children sometimes how to sew, and occasionally how to do housework, and that not always in the best and most approved ways. The boys, if they are of the wealthy or middle classes, are not taught anything of manual labor, nor are the poor boys taught much thereof. Here and there, in New York and Philadelphia and Boston, trade and working-men’s schools have been established. Chicago is about to fall in line, and Indianapolis has done so; but Detroit, beset so much by sentimental charity, bereft so much of practical, has an Industrial School where some modeling and some carving were once taught, but which is, for the most part (or was until

recently), simply a school for indigent children. The Young Men's Christian Association has made a small beginning of a class in manual education. But the great scheme that was put forth a few years ago to establish a technical school in our city has fallen through. What is the matter with the men and the women of Detroit? Why will they not stop and think? Trade-schools are the greatest desiderata of the day; and one such school, well equipped, would do more good for the oncoming generation than a hundred reformatory institutions; and this, as I have shown, the reformatory institutions demonstrate beyond cavil. The kindergartens make a beginning of teaching children how to use their hands, and our Industrial School has done much to advocate and to assist in the establishment of these most useful beginnings of a better system of education; but the kindergartens only make a beginning. It is high time that the public authorities took them up and added them to the educational curriculum of the city on one end, and at the same time technical schools on the other. But do not let me be understood as advocating manual training simply for the poor—for those who must perforce earn their living by their

hands; I advocate it for all the youth of the land. And for two reasons:

First, because truth and fact can nowhere be learned so easily as in making something that is correct in the concrete; and truth and fact are the bases of morality. It has been ascertained by a clergyman of our church who has interested himself in this great question that whereas many of the graduates of the common schools have been convicted of crime and sent to the penitentiaries, comparatively few of the graduates of the trade-schools have become criminals.

And some most remarkable testimony has come to me since writing the above, in the January number of the *Review of Reviews*. In an article on the Industrial Christian Alliance of New York, Mr. Millbury, the founder and manager of the same, says, speaking of the drift of human *débris* that comes to the net of the association for salvation: "Careful individual records are kept, showing: First, that foreigners or sons of foreigners do not predominate. Second, that few men apply for help who have learned a trade; the prolonged discipline a boy receives in learning a trade compels regular habits, which become a bulwark against shiftlessness and the

evils that attend it. Third, that the men who demand most deserve least. Fourth, that boys born in the slums become toughs or criminals, but outcast beggars rarely; their boyhood's fierce fight for existence develops self-reliance. Fifth, that a sorrowfully large proportion have begun life brilliantly, with every advantage of birth and education."

Secondly, because if all the youth of the land were educated in manual labor there would be a closeness of touch, and consequently a *rapprochement* and more of sympathy, between all sorts and conditions of men; and labor would be dignified. The dread of work that soils the hands and clothing would disappear, and a school of American workmen would arise that would be at once the honor and the safeguard of the nation. How can manual labor appear other than disgraceful to the rich, when only those who cannot escape it are forced into the ranks of the working-men? Not that manual labor is disgraceful; but it is disgraceful that young men who are forced to work with their hands are put so often to school in the employment of some rough master, where they receive but little else than kicks and "a pull" now and then at "the

growler," and learn their trade as best they can. No wonder that so many of our workmen receive as much cursing as coin.

Of the education of the mind it is not necessary to speak. Most of the States of the Union have been zealous in developing their systems of mental education; Michigan stands in the very front rank of them, and on the top of her excellent common schools is placed the admirable University of Michigan, at Ann Arbor, with its hundreds of devoted professors and its thousands of hard-working, enthusiastic students. But while we congratulate ourselves on the common schools and the State universities of the land, we must remember that for the most part they help only to create a nimbleness of mind; and nimbleness of mind means nimbleness in the acquisition of wealth—the great idol of the American people. Far more is done for the education of the well-to-do in the higher branches of knowledge than for the education of the masses of the country in the few underlying facts and truths of education. Indeed, while room is always made for the young in the high schools and universities, they are crowded out by the thousands from the primary schools, and they never have a suf-

ficient number of instructors in the rudiments of knowledge.

But I must pass on to the moral and religious education of the young—to the things that concern the preservation as well as the well-being of society. Where do children get their training in morality and religion? At home, of course, some training is given in morals and some in religion, but not much. Children are commanded not to lie, and they are taught “to say their prayers”; and that about sums up the training they receive at home in the greatest things of life. Morality is left for the day-schools to teach, and religion for the Sunday-schools.

I want, in this connection, to point out to you something that is working great harm to the children of the country, and yet for which no adequate remedy can at present be found. I have reference to the shutting out of religion from the public schools. I cannot enter upon a full discussion of the reasons why this thing has been done, except to say, even as you know, that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church some thirty years ago averred that the religion taught in the public schools was not fair to their claims, and that the teaching of Christianity by

public-school teachers ought therefore to cease. "We are a part of the nation," they said; "we pay our share of the taxes; it is not right that instruction should be given in religion in such ways that it hurts us." And the American people are just; they said, "Well, if this is so, instruction in religion must cease in our public schools." And so religion—the thing of chiefest importance to men—is left out of all the hours of teaching during the week, and is crowded into a single hour on Sunday. We do our best in the hour given us; but how poor our best is is attested by every honest Sunday-school publication in the land. They publish confession after confession of shortcoming and defeat.

But how about morality? Cannot morality be taught in the public schools? Not very well. It is a dangerous thing to attempt to teach children the best ways of living by teaching them a few abstract principles. There must be a practical, a concrete example of morality placed before them, or they will learn only by the intellect; and morality is a matter of the heart. And this teaching of morality by example is only in line with the best methods of instruction in other things. Drawing is no more taught by

saying to a child, "Draw an imaginary straight line; draw so many imaginary curves." It is taught from geometrical blocks and casts. And so botany is not taught to-day by saying that the flowers have such and such stamens, petals, and the rest, but by pointing to the flower, and showing its parts and their utility and function. And if morality is to be taught by example, where shall we go for an example? To Buddha? I have a great affection for the "light of India," but I refuse to go for my morality to a man who went away and left his wife and children. Shall I go to Socrates? I like the shaggy old man, but he was a vulgar citizen at the best, and just before his death commanded Crito not to forget the cock he had vowed to Æsculapius. No, no; we can go nowhere but to Jesus the Christ, and this leads us to religion.

I claim that morality cannot be taught without recourse to religion; without pointing out to scholars that its great rules rest always upon religious sanctions; and I was astonished, in the course of some reading, to discover that Dr. Felix Adler, of the Society for Ethical Culture, took the same view of the indissoluble association of these two great things. In a note to an article

written by himself in the *Ethical Record* for July, 1889, he says: "I have confined myself in the above to speaking of moral instruction. Religious instruction is also given in our classes. It consists chiefly of the study of the best spiritual literature, ancient and modern, including, of course, the choicest passages from the Old and New Testaments. But it should be remembered that Plato at one end of the line and Emerson at the other are as important in their way as Isaiah and St. Paul. I believe that a first-hand acquaintance with the best spiritual literature of the world is indispensable to a genuine spiritual culture. A series of lectures to the oldest pupils on the practical philosophy of life is designed to conclude a system of religious teaching." And it is precisely to this same effect that Professor George Herbert Palmer wrote in the *Forum* for January, 1893. I shall not quote from that article at length; it is sufficient to say that he maintains by the most cogent reasoning that not morality, but only ethics can be taught in the public schools; and to attempt to teach children ethics—which is theory—without practice—which is morality—is, says he, "dangerous business," and has "but the slenderest chance of suc-

cess." "The idea that a boy's moral education can be fashioned by his teacher in the same way as his education in geography is fantastic."

My friends, do we not know that children are, above all things, religious? The faith of the little child is proverbial. What a sin it is, then, to keep from them the knowledge of the things that make up so much of their happiness; that cause to spring up in their hearts an appreciation of the greatness and of the glory of the kingdom of heaven! What a shame it is not to teach little children the truths that will make them, as men, to desire to be as children are—to be, that is, in a state wherein they feel that they are beloved of, and that they love, their God!

And this is the wonder of childhood: all that we teach little children we teach ourselves. They learn and we learn many a lesson, many a task, many an aspiration; but, above all, they learn and we learn love as a fact; and when it is once so learned it can never be lost, but must inevitably transform us and all our nature more and more into the image of Him who came into the world as a little child.

V.

THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND THE REFORMATION OF CRIMINALS.*

"I was in prison, and ye came unto Me."—MATT. xxv. 36.

I WISH to speak to you to-day upon some questions of penology—the reasons why we should interest ourselves in ascertaining, and putting into effect, the best methods that will secure the best results in the prevention of crime and the reformation of criminals. It will be well, perhaps, before entering particularly into our subject, to call to mind the Christian principle which underlies the duty of visiting prisoners and seeking to do them good.

Christ, as you know, is the Son of man, or, as we may say, the Son of humanity; and therefore He is part of, and one with, every man that has lived, or does live, or shall ever live in the world. You see, as He is one with God, He is one with all mankind; and so it is that in the great and

* Preached October, 1893.

terrible day when the Son of man shall come with all His holy angels, He identifies Himself with each man that has ever lived. He says to the assembled nations, as He separates the good from the bad, the approved from the unapproved: "Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and ye gave Me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave Me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took Me in: naked, and ye clothed Me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto Me."

You perceive that Christ identifies Himself here with every hungry and thirsty and starving and naked and sick man, with every prisoner, who shall ever have been in the world. Ah, wonderful condescension! How it should teach us to care for, to provide for, to work for, the unfortunate sons of man! And mark, I do not speak of the rewards that shall be given to those who shall care and provide and work for Christ in the ways He has pointed out. I wish to draw your attention now to the reason why we should do these things, as the principle is laid down in our religion. It is because Jesus Christ our

Saviour has said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

But there are other reasons (though this is the best, and, as best, sufficient) why we should interest ourselves in questions of penology. There is the humanitarian reason. There is the economic reason. There is the reason that springs out of the necessity of self-preservation and the welfare of society.

The humanitarian reason is mixed up, of course, with our religion, and will scarcely be disassociated from the teaching of Christ; that is, we learn to love humanity only as we have seen that we ought to do so after the precept and example of the Master of life. Still, men have endeavored to arouse an enthusiasm for erring humanity apart from the teaching of Christ; and we will let this enthusiasm pass without any discussion of the fact that without Christ's teaching they never would have been able to do so.

There is a human reason why men should be interested in the reformation of the life and characters of other men; it is this: because they believe at the bottom of their souls that all men

are brothers, and, as the Greek poet puts it, "the offspring of God." They believe this out of their inner consciousness, and they are convinced of it through the wonderful story of heredity. Just think of it! When we count up we find that in the twentieth generation back of us we have a million of ancestors; and the twentieth generation means simply going back to the twelfth or thirteenth century. Admitting that when examined critically this computation will be shorn of its proportions by reason of consanguineous marriages, the fact remains that every human being has had within recent times a multitude of ancestors. And when we carry the story back to the beginning of the Christian era, when the world was small and men but few in number, we must see that we all have running in our veins the same blood. Men are brothers in fact as well as in feeling, and the old question that was asked by Cain in the dawn of history is answered now by the affirmation of all—we are our brothers' keepers.

The second reason why we should interest ourselves in the best ways for the reformation of criminals is, as I said, the economic one. "Man," as says Aristotle, "is a social being,"

and he must live in a society. He does live in a society. He has really no place in the world outside of society. The society in which man lives is the state. We call the state in North America the United States, but it is a different thing. The United States is the government; the state is the government, the land, the inhabitants, their multitudinous relationships the one to the other, the general social well-being, the particular individual social welfare.

The state is a whole—the whole of all the distinct and separate things and people around and about which its shield is thrown; and, as it is made up of living men and women and children, it has life in it; and, as it has life, it is not an aggregation, but an organism. Now there is such a thing as the general well-being of the state—a general health and vitality; and in this general health and vitality all who are parts of the state should rejoice and participate.

But suppose there are some parts of the state that are weak and diseased: what then? The general health of the state will suffer, and in the decline of the general health all its members will suffer together. It is as clear as the results of addition and subtraction. But there is another,

a subreason—growing out of the fact that the state is a whole and we but parts of it—why we should interest ourselves in the reformation of criminals—the reason that touches our pockets. It costs an immense amount of money to maintain a strong force of police, sheriffs, and jurors, innumerable police courts, great hotel-like prisons. I shall not resort to statistics; but the cost of all these things, as assessed upon the counties or the state at large, is enormous. How much less it would cost to educate the criminal or the would-become criminal so that he would learn to do good and eschew evil I leave to the statisticians; but you can easily calculate for yourselves that it would be much less.

The third reason, as I have said, why we should do what we can to prevent crime and to reform criminals springs out of the necessity for self-preservation and the general social well-being.

I do not think it too much to say that what men desire chiefly is peace—the right and privilege of living quietly and peacefully in their respective stations without fear of wrong and harm; and to secure this they know that society must be wholesome and sound. But how can

society be wholesome and sound when there is a large criminal class, and a still larger number of men and women bordering upon it, ready to tumble in, ready to break up the basis of society—the great number of lowly and simple people upon whom the social pyramid rests? How can society be wholesome and sound when through it all there are men and women who, but for social reasons, would be sent to school to learn by compulsion to live righteously, since they will not learn to do so by their own perverted wills? Said Mr. William M. F. Round, secretary of the National Prison Association, in the *Forum* for September last: “No man has a right to complain if burglars enter his second-story windows or blow up his bank safe, or if he be garroted in the street or his name forged to a check, who has not taken his part as a citizen in eradicating this dangerous class.” And I say no man has a right to complain if his family, if he himself, is tainted and made bad, who tolerates and covers up the wicked acts and deeds of his associates because they are important in the social world.

But what is crime—in what does it consist? Is it wrong thinking? No; though this is undoubtedly the basis of it. Is it all wrong-doing?

No. It is wrong-doing that the state takes cognizance of. All offenses punishable by law are criminal. In the general sense—that is, in the sense in which I now use it—crime includes every offense, from the highest to the lowest, in the grade of offenses—both those that are called misdemeanors and those that are called felonies. As a rule, let me say that the laws that define what crimes are are exact. Most crimes are defined by statutes, though there are some that are not; these are called crimes under the common law—that is, under the law generally recognized in England, and which has continued to be recognized in the United States.

I am not going into an enumeration of crimes; it is sufficient to say that the state (and by the state I mean now both the general government of the nation and the especial governments of the individual States) says to its citizens, “Thou shalt not do this, thou shalt do that”—for both to do and not to do some things sometimes are criminal; and the state says, “If you do this, if you do not do that, you shall be punished.”

Let me say that I have no time to-day to speak of criminal procedure—that is, of how the law in regard to crime is administered, and especially

of how it ought to be administered. We all know—we who know anything about it—that our present criminal procedure is slow, lax, and inexact; full of loopholes by which the guilty may escape, full of pitfalls into which the innocent may stumble. I would like to raise my voice, “trumpet-tongued,” demanding a reformation of the whole machinery of criminal procedure; but I must confine myself to my topic: the prevention of crime and the reformation of criminals. Let me say, however, in passing, that the only hope and stay of the community to-day in reference to criminal procedure is the just and upright judge—such an one as he* who lately entered into the rest that remaineth for the people of God.

Now, when we regard the state and the topic of crime, two questions arise in our minds: first, For what end does the state declare certain acts of commission or of omission to be criminal? and, secondly, Why, if such acts be done or left undone, does the state punish? The state, as I have said, stands for the well-being of its members, i.e., its chiefest duty is to see that its mem-

* The late Hon. George Sedgwick Swift, sometime junior warden of St. John's Church, Detroit.

bers have life, peace, and the pursuit of happiness. All things, therefore, that interfere with these great liberties upon the part of all must be suppressed. And if the question arises upon the part of the individual, "Can I not do as I please with mine own?" the answer comes, "No; you can only so use your own as not to hurt another." Hurt is here meant in relation to the things the state has declared to be criminal. We are not speaking of morals; yet be it observed that all crimes are based upon moral precepts as their ultimate sanctions. The state, then, declares certain acts to be criminal in order to protect society, i.e., men in relation to themselves and to the state. Yet let me say that though the state says, "Thou shalt not do this, thou shalt do that," the best exponent of the end for which the state exists is not criminal law. Criminal law is in reality a contrary of the exponent. The exponent of the end is found in two words, according as you look at the state from a legal or from a religious standpoint—justice, righteousness. And so it is that the state says to her members in the first instance, "Live honestly;" and to live honestly, as says the old Roman law, is "to hurt no one,

and to give each his due." *Honeste vivere, neminem lædere, suum cuique tribuere.*

We have seen that the end for which the state exists is the well-being of all its members, and that this is best promoted by the justice and righteousness of all law; then criminal law should be such as will best promote justice and righteousness. Should criminal law, therefore, be vindictive? No; a thousand times, no! What should it be, then? It should be rectifying, remedial—that by which justice and righteousness shall be promoted; and by justice I do not mean exact justice, but conformity to right; and by righteousness I mean that conduct that seeks the highest ideal of living.

Punishment for crime, then, must, in my opinion, keep justice and righteousness immediately in view; and to secure these things the adjudged criminal must not simply be punished; his conscience must be educated—he must be made to see the wrongfulness of his deeds, and to try in the future to amend his way of living. He must be made to endeavor to restore what he can to the wronged, and so to regulate his conduct as to become better and better, until righteousness is attained. In other words, criminal

law should have as its ultimate object remaking and not punishment, though punishment, be it observed, is to be used as a means to secure this object.

And now let me say a word as to prevention of crime; for prevention and reformation are often identical, not in the beginning of the career of a criminal, but after some crime has been committed. How can crimes be prevented? There are, generally speaking, but two ways: by shutting a criminal up and keeping him from the society of men, or by educating him—teaching him the heinousness of wrong-doing, and putting in his heart the desire and the determination to do that which is right.

Let me divide the topic:

1. As to the prevention of crime before the man (or the woman or child) has been adjudged a criminal.

2. As to keeping a criminal shut up and apart from society, and so preventing crime.

3. As to the reformation of a criminal generally, and so preventing him from committing criminal acts in the future.

1. As to the first head of my topic, let me say, I believe that all men can be so educated as to

hate crime and to keep from it. And I believe that we should educate them—your sons and mine, and our neighbor's—so that they will flee from the very appearance of evil, like as Lot fled from Sodom. And I believe that it is education in justice and righteousness that makes us to avoid wrong-doing, rather than hereditary tendencies to goodness. We who are of the educated classes are supposed to inherit our virtues, but it is not so; we are educated in them and up to them. Says Mr. Round in another place in the article I have cited: "I wish to put myself on record, after a study of the criminal, and contrary to my previous utterances, as going squarely back to the doctrine of FREE WILL as laid down by our fathers; and I wish to be understood distinctly and squarely to hold the doctrine of moral responsibility as applying to every sane individual; at the same time making all allowances for such physical conditions as may weaken the will, and in some cases destroy it. I do not believe for one moment that crime is a disease, nor by any necessity the result of a disease, though I do believe that it may be the result of disease in some instances. I do not believe that crime and disease are identical, and

I am almost afraid of the analogy between them, lest humanity's heritage of Freedom of the Will be misunderstood."

The will is free; this God's revelation has taught us, even as the observations of men teach. I cite, in further confirmation of this great principle, the words of Mr. Israel C. Jones, from an article in the *New York Observer*. Mr. Jones was for many years in charge of the House of Refuge on Randall's Island, New York. "I am able, after an experience of more than forty years with nearly twenty thousand juvenile delinquents, to indorse Mr. Round's views touching the power of heredity in criminals as a predisposing cause to crime. Among this large number of young offenders I can state with entire confidence that not one percent. were children born of criminal parents; and with equal confidence I am able to say that the common cause of their delinquency was found in bad parental training, in bad companionship, and in a lack of wholesome restraint from evil associations and influences. It was this knowledge that led to the establishing of the House of Refuge nearly three quarters of a century ago."

You see, then, how much responsibility rests upon you—upon you and each of you—who have brought children into the world; the prevention of crime in the first instance is in the hands of parents. They must educate, train, their children in justice and righteousness from generation to generation. And what they neglect to do the state must do for them.

2. As to the second head of my topic I want to say that I believe that there are certain classes of criminals that should always be incarcerated and kept from preying upon society. There are some so hardened through neglect of their education that they seem to have lost the power, if not the desire, to do better. And there are some so weak of mind that they have never had a proper desire to do well. It seems to me that the state should in these cases enact a law that, when a man has twice been sentenced for a major crime, or thrice for a petty one, he should be imprisoned for the rest of his life. Again, there are some crimes for which a criminal should be incarcerated for life without hope of pardon, and kept away from the homes of men—to wit, murder, arson, and rape. Pardon in these cases should be extended only where new evidence has

been discovered, and there has been a failure of justice.

3. As to the reformation of criminals generally, and so preventing them from committing criminal acts in the future, let me say that I have anticipated myself somewhat by showing you that men can be educated so as to have no desire and no will to commit criminal acts, though I admit that experience shows that there are a few who are exceptions to this broad rule. Leaving the exceptions out of consideration, I say that men can be so educated as not to desire to commit crimes; and that when occasionally they lapse into evil, they can be so educated as not to commit crimes again. It is a difficult task to do this after a man has entered the criminal class, but it can be done. And this is the objective point of my discourse.

The States' prisons should not be mere houses of detention, but should be schools—not voluntary, but compulsory schools—where the men and the women and the children who have been adjudged to be criminals should be educated, reformed, by men and women of broad and tender sympathies, and thus lifted out of the class of criminals and made respectable members of soci-

ety. The only question for the state—for us who are parts of it—is, What are the best methods to be employed? I cannot enter fully upon what are the best methods, and discuss them here; I must leave this topic to the men who have made scientific and experimental studies in penology; but this I can say—for upon this all who have given any attention to this great subject have agreed—that no adjudged criminal should be sentenced for a definite term, but for an indefinite time, the same not to be longer than the longest term permitted by the law for the crime. And I aver that no criminals, except those who belong to the second class I have spoken of, should be incarcerated in a prison, but in a school or reformatory where they can be taught as speedily as possible the things that make for justice and righteousness, and the things that will enable them to earn a livelihood in some legitimate way; and that as soon as they shall have been taught these things and have given assurance of their reformation, they should be permitted to go forth into the world. I would not have them go forth, however, without some check. They should be released on parole; and then when the time of parole is ended, be freed forever from

all control, unless, indeed, they should commit some crime again.

Of the means that should be employed in the education of criminals I have no time to speak. If you are interested, send to the Elmira Reformatory in the State of New York, and the authorities will send you books and papers that will make your hearts burn with gratitude for the many means that Christian men have discovered to accomplish this end. And the Elmira Reformatory has not been in existence quite seventeen years; Harvard College has been doing its work for nearly two centuries.

The Elmira Reformatory was established by a law passed in the year 1875. The main idea is this: When a prisoner shall be adjudged to be a criminal, the court shall sentence him for a time not longer than the longest term fixed as the penalty for the act, and not shorter than the shortest term. The prisoner shall then be committed to the Reformatory at Elmira. Here, after inquiries and examinations made by the superintendent, he is placed in the second or intermediate grade, and it depends upon himself whether he goes up to the first or down to the third. He is made to understand the rules

of behavior, he is assigned to the class in school fitted to his capacity, and he is put into the workshop that is best adapted to him. He is informed of the maximum time for which he can be detained, and that he can, by perfect conduct in all three lines of effort, win his release in one year. And this is the great incentive to reform. Constant watch is kept, of course, and the prisoner finds it hard to play false. As he usually begins by trying to do so, he goes rapidly from one grade to another, until at last he settles down and gains the highest grade fairly. But to do so is not easy; he has to be perfect in three things—labor, school, and conduct. If he remains perfect in the first grade for six months he may then, in the discretion of the manager, be sent out on parole. But he is not released on parole until a place is found for him. If the paroled continues to behave himself for six months he receives his final discharge; if he backslides he is rearrested and brought back, and must begin over again. The Elmira Reformatory reports that eighty percent. of its inmates have gone forth regenerated.

One word more, and I have done. There is a decision of one of the courts of this State that a

provision in the constitution of Michigan prevents a judge from sentencing a criminal for an indefinite length of time. At the last meeting of the Michigan Political Science Association a committee was appointed (of which I am glad to say I am a member) to petition the legislature to go to work to secure a change in the constitution and laws of the State, so that the courts may sentence criminals for an indefinite time. I ask you, if you are interested in the prevention of crime and the reformation of criminals—that is to say, if you are alive to the obligations of your citizenship—to do all you can to help to secure this change; to endeavor to abolish the old methods that have prevailed in our prisons, that make them schools, not of virtue, but of iniquity!

VI.

“COMMON HONESTY.”

“A false balance is abomination to the Lord : but a just weight is His delight.”—PROV. xi. 1.

SOME time ago the late Mr. Froude, the English historian, brought a remarkable indictment against his country, of which the following is the first count: “From the great house in the City of London to the village grocer, the commercial life in England has been saturated with fraud. So deep has it gone that a strictly honest tradesman can hardly hold his own against competition. You can no longer trust that the article that you buy is the thing which it pretends to be. We have false weights, false measures, cheating and shoddy everywhere.”

It seems to me that Mr. Froude overstates his case somewhat, and for this reason : that the vast system of credit by which business is carried on to-day could not be maintained a year unless there was, in spite of the cheating and defrauding that goes on, an underlying sense of honesty

in the hearts of the men of England; besides which, we know that Mr. Froude was not always accurate in statement; indeed, that he was sometimes led into trouble by the wealth of his rhetoric. Yet there is, no doubt, good ground for saying that in past years, since competition has become so keen and profits so small, and trusts and combinations have sprung into existence, the common principle of common honesty has lost much of its hold on the practices of men. The old Roman maxim, which is the rule of the common law, *caveat emptor*—"The buyer must take care"—is applied with a harshness that was never intended, and which is against sound morality as well as Christian charity. Under it men say that if people are fools enough to pay ten prices for novelties because they are fashionable, or allow themselves to be deceived by the glitter and show of shoddy, they have a right to fleece them.

And besides the rivalry of producers and the mean maxim of the law, there has come into play another thing that leads to dishonesty, not only in England, but in the United States—yes, in the whole world. It is the desire to get rich very fast, either for the brute power of riches

or for the ability to live luxuriously. This is the curse of the age—this continual seeking for wealth; this custom of measuring men's worth only by the sum of their worldly possessions; but

“A man's a man for a' that.”

In the pride of birth there was much room for high and exalted feeling; there is but little in the pride of wealth. Rank to-day is indeed “the guinea's stamp”; the intrinsic value of the man may be nothing.

It is precisely this thing that causes us to wink at dishonest methods of business men, when the users of them have become successful; for, though we may condemn the offenses of the petty tradesmen in using false weights and measures, we condone the great offenses of the big merchants who take by legal, yet by sharp, practices all the profits of the lesser out of the trade they control. Look at the recent transactions of the “sugar king” of the Pacific, for instance. He took so much of the profits that there should be in the sale of sugar that the poor distributors were often compelled to sell that merchandise at less than its cost. Thus we can scarcely wonder that some unscrupulous

traders gave short weight. I do not know how it is now with the Sugar Trust in their treatment of the retailers; but as to their treatment of the public, and especially of the public government, all the world knows it is corrupt. It has been charged that the Sugar Trust entered the Senate of the United States and bought up some of its members, and that charge has never been disproved. I am told that this trust has taken more money out of the pockets of the people of some of the States in the West than the combined results of State taxation in those States.

Men should be satisfied with fair returns on the amount of business that they do; they should fix no more than a just price on all their goods. I tell you, my friends, that just prices and just wages, simple as they are, will revolutionize all of the present commercial conditions of the world. Men should not only live themselves, but they should let others live. "*Leben und leben lassen*" should be the rule of trade. It is the intense selfishness of the grasping and pigeon-hearted that stands in the way of honest dealing. There are men who will live, and live well, no matter who may go to the wall.

It is curious how many there are who have dis-

honest ways of doing business, yet who feel that it is all right, that "business is business," and that so long as their methods are not forbidden by a strict construction of the law, they do no wrong. These men come often to church, give of their money to support charitable institutions, listen to the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" with self-complacency, and feel that they are very respectable members of society. In the same way it is remarkable how many so-called "respectable" members of society there are who lease their property, or permit it to be leased, for evil and unhallowed purposes. There is many a man who holds himself out as a hater of vice—yea, as a reformer of it—who will not hesitate to permit his agent to let his store for the purposes of a low saloon; yes, who will not hesitate to permit his agent to lease it for worse purposes still. These men are the whited sepulchres that our Lord spoke of, which indeed appear beautiful without, but within are full of dead men's bones. I have often thought, if the men who owned saloon property were compelled to take out the licenses for saloons, the cause of temperance would be much advanced. And, indeed, I am convinced that this is the highroad to all re-

form. Property-owners should be held responsible for every use to which their property is put. When it is put to an unlawful use they should be brought before some competent court to show cause why they should not be fined. And only when they could clear their skirts of all guilt of knowledge should they be permitted to go free. In every case where a license has been granted to be used on any property, and where there has been an unlawful use, it should be irrevocably revoked as regards that property.

And so, likewise, it is remarkable how many men there are who prepare articles for the adulteration of other articles of trade, who think that they are not blameworthy. I am sure I do not see where the difference is between the procurer and the sinner. The tempter is always as bad as, if not worse than, the tempted and fallen. I recollect several years ago talking with a man who had dealt largely in foreign fruit in the market of one of our cities. He said, casually, "How the ways of trade have changed! Why, years ago we used to throw away all the shells of the cocoanut; then we were asked to sell them whole, and now we have our own mill to grind them." "Grind cocoanut-shells!" I said; "and

what for?" "Oh, for adulteration; we sell the product to several trades, chiefly to the pepper-dealers." This man held his head high, and was a power for good in some ways. I have no doubt that he excused himself with the plea that it was necessary for him to sell these ground-up shells, because thereby he lessened the price of the cocoanut-meat; and that, if he did not sell his shells, his competitors, who sold theirs, would undersell him in the price of it. But this does not alter the principle of the case: a man, after all, does not have to get rich—he need not be a millionaire—but he ought to be an honest man. This trader became, through the sale of the ground-up shells, a participant in the fraud of the pepper-dealers; an accessory, before the fact, to all their false dealings.

And thus it is, in a thousand ways, men are deficient in the every-day virtue of common honesty; and those who profess to be Christians often give the lie to their profession. Besides the examples of dishonest dealings such as I have mentioned, which men have permitted under the head of "commercial morality" (commercial immorality, we ought to call it), and which so many of the citizens of the world wink

at, there are many others that all agree are dishonest, yet which are so constantly practised by men who ought to blush to think how low they have sunk in the estimation of the just that we have all lost sight of their iniquity. Such admittedly dishonest ways are the watering of stocks, the freezing out of minority shareholders, the making of blanket-mortgages and fraudulent assignments, the wrecking of banks and railroads, and the like. These things are so common in the business world that though men admit they are dishonest, yet do they simply shrug their shoulders at them—especially when these ways have gotten wealth for those who have practised them. For my own part, I say frankly that no company ought to be permitted by the law to capitalize its stock for more than its actual assets, fixed and determined by some competent court; that the issuing of stock for nothing—for a patent, perhaps, that has no intrinsic value—should be regarded as a crime, when the issuers of that stock “have taken the public in.” As regards the freezing out of minorities by majorities, and the stockholders by the bondholders, how can men who say “Our Father” be guilty of such things! Who will tell of the vast sums

of money that the English investors have lost through the fraudulent management of the railways in the United States alone? As regards the making of blanket-mortgages and false assignments, it is not necessary to speak; frauds of this kind, when they are given out to the world, are apparent to all. As regards the wrecking of banks and railroads, the men who are guilty of these things should be held to be public enemies, and treated, as such, to long terms in the States' prisons. They should be forever deprived of citizenship.

There are two phases of commercial life upon which I desire to dwell especially, because they are general in effect, and cast a shadow upon all trade: they are incendiary fires and insolvency. I am told by men engaged in the business of fire-insurance—especially in the part of it called adjusting—that the uninitiated have no idea of the extent of the frauds perpetrated by men setting fire to their own premises. So far has this species of fraud extended that it has been proposed that there should be fire coroners, who will inquire into the origin of fires, as cases of manslaughter are inquired into. Fire is an easy method to get rid of old stock; it is an easy way

to get money for goods that were never had in possession. Why, it is astonishing to hear how many people will talk of "a convenient fire." I have heard men say again and again, "Well, what this building wants is a good fire." Something must be done to stamp out both this thing and the sentiment of this thing.

Of insolvency, it is said by good authority that ninety percent. of all business men fail at least once in their lives. Of these there are many cases which are the results of misfortune simply, such as these recent hard times; but the majority are the outcome of gross mismanagement, if not of fraud. How few there are who venture out upon the seas of commerce who are mentally and morally equipped for the dangers thereof! How few there are who understand what debit and credit mean; who understand that no business can be carried on, under the present conditions of trade, without credits, and credits mean corresponding debits! They take little heed of the fact that it is dishonest to make a debt unless there is a credit (or, it may be, stock in trade) to back it, and so they speedily run into financial straits and bankruptcy. It is said by Blackstone that "bankruptcy laws are considered

as laws calculated for the benefit of trade, and are founded on principles of humanity as well as justice.” “But they are cautious of encouraging prodigality and extravagance, and therefore they allow the benefit of the laws to none but actual traders, since that set of men are, generally speaking, the only persons liable to accidental losses and to an inability of paying their debts without fault of their own.” And he adds: “It is to the misfortunes, therefore, of the debtors that the law has given a compassionate remedy, but denied it to their faults.” And so it ought to be; there is no bankruptcy law except the old bankruptcy law of the United States which allows or allowed all sorts of men—traders, physicians, lawyers, clergymen, and the rest—to take advantage of its provisions. This old law, in my opinion, encouraged speculation. The principle upon which the debtor is bound to conduct himself toward his creditors is prudence; and if he has been prudent, if disaster comes, then, and then only, should the trader have the benefit of the law for bankrupts.

The rules of prudence which are, I think, deserving of attention in this connection are three; and they are: First, fitness for the busi-

ness undertaken. The first duty of a man of business is to assure himself that he has capacity and skill to manage the business in which he is about to engage. How many failures are traceable to personal unfitness! We cannot tell of them any more than the sands by the seaside can tell of the wrecks that have been thrown up on them. Secondly: the second rule of prudence is the reduction of trade to a minimum of speculation. There are few business men who will admit the soundness of this rule, and yet they often adopt it as a principle of copartnership, when they stipulate that neither partner shall "dabble in stocks." The principle, too, is well recognized in the laws of bankruptcy; in our late national act there was a provision that if a debtor lost any part of his property in gambling he forfeited his right to a discharge. But business men will say that while outside the limits of their especial business gambling may be wrong, yet inside those limits a certain degree of speculation is inevitable. And so it is; but this very distinction contains an admission that the speculations ought, in good morals, to be confined to the limits of necessity. Third: the third rule of prudence which it is incum-

bent upon men to observe is that of careful living. No man has a right to take so much of the assets out of his business for his living that he thereby jeopardizes the payment of the debts he owes. The obligation of the observance of simplicity of living arises from the fact that a man, by contracting debts, takes upon himself the probability of insolvency.

I cannot say that the non-observance of the first rule of prudence—that of not appreciating one's unfitness for any especial business—is dishonest, but surely the non-observance of the second rule—that of the avoidance of too much speculation—often becomes so; and the non-observance of the third rule—that of the obligation of simplicity in living—is always dishonest. The man who lives in luxury and extravagance off the credits that others have made to him on the understanding that he will conduct his business with care, is wanting in the principle of common honesty. Too many men are so wanting. Ask your bankers, ask your credit agents, whether it is not so.

But Mr. Froude has another count in his indictment that I want to bring to your notice. He says: “Many hundreds of sermons have I

heard in England—many a dissertation on the mysteries of the faith, on the divine mission of the clergy, etc., etc.; but during all these years, never one sermon that I can recollect on common honesty.” The answer is, of course, that, as we speak of the air we breathe as a thing well understood, and but rarely analyze it, so we speak of the eighth commandment and seldom apply it in detail. There are some principles of conduct so well understood that we scarcely do more than speak of them. It is patent to all—conscience, like the voice of God from the Mount of Sinai, speaks ever, “Thou shalt not steal.” Men know that though, through the errors of thought, they may worship false divinities or no divinities at all; they know that though, through the passions of the senses, they may be guilty of lust and debauchery, yet that for theft—for downright theft—they have no excuse. And it is for this reason that a thief bears about him, wherever he goes, a weight of opprobrium that time does not lessen.

It is not necessary for the Church to preach “common honesty”; that has a sanction in human nature apart from her teachings. You know it has, and that you yourselves ought to

practise it by word and by deed. The Church teaches that way of living which will make men just and fair in all their dealings, and then lets their sense of justice and fairness do the work for the redemption of commercial dealings. And this she has always done when she has preached the God and Man Jesus Christ, “the way, the truth, and the life.” There is in the person of Christ an unchangeable, universal standard of morality, whether applied in society, in trade, in government, or in social relations. In the person of Jesus Christ, I say, the world of trade has a standard by which all dealings can be weighed and measured. It is because men have fixed their eyes on expediency and utility on the one hand, and on wealth and success on the other, that they have turned away from the teachings of our Lord.

The whole trouble may be stated in these words: that trade, in its desire for wealth and success, has become untrue to the law—both to the statute law and to the law of conscience. It has repudiated the Christ! Men have wilfully, knowingly, divided their lives into two parts, the secular and the religious; and they have shut out religion from the part that they call secular,

When they shall have admitted religion into their whole lives, and given it full scope every way, then trade will be elevated to the high place it ought to occupy in the estimation of men; for trade—commerce—is the thing that makes the lives of all men, so far as this world goes, to be worth the living. I see—I am sure I see—light ahead. A public opinion is in process of formation that will have all business to be based upon sound economics and just morality. It is true that the adulteration of merchandise has not, as yet, in all cases been declared to be immoral; yet there is a tendency in legislation to force manufacturers to brand their goods, and to say exactly what they are. There is a tendency, too, in legislation to rectify the abuses of corporations, and to make them to live as honest creatures in an honest State. As for the abolition of the rule of *caveat emptor*, as men shall see that they are brothers they will cease to throw all the responsibility of the bargain upon the buyer, who does not know the goods, and will assume that responsibility themselves. As for incendiary fires, something will be done to correct them by the insurance companies, and by those who have to pay larger premiums than

they otherwise would, in order to enable the companies to pay fraudulent losses.

The great danger, as I see it, is the danger from overspeculation, and from the desire for luxurious and extravagant living at any cost to anybody. I would not have the Church to appoint committees, as do the Quakers, to visit its members, and to examine and see that they are not speculating too much and living beyond their means; yet I think that the whole conservative force of the Church and society should be brought to bear upon the men who recklessly risk the property of others in speculation; who recklessly eat up the assets which they ought to keep intact to meet the debts that they have contracted. Will you not do your parts in trying to bring about a better state of affairs in the trade of the land? It is a result that you are interested in, whether you be rich or poor; because trade is the great factor by which civilization can be promoted at home, and its borders enlarged abroad, and the life of the nation preserved and transmitted with vigorous power to the oncoming generations of men.

VII.

THE SIN OF GOSSIP.

“The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell.”—JAMES iii. 6.

THE ways of the world are curious indeed! We purchase tickets and go to the theatre and hear some great actors present “The School for Scandal”; we laugh and applaud all the hits that are made against envy, hatred, and malice; we are glad to see Sir Benjamin Backbite and his set discomfited, and innocence triumph; we flatter ourselves that we are not as these patched and powdered and furbelowed men and women of the Georgian period; yet I have not the slightest doubt that if the audience could change places with the players, and tell the story of the intrigues and scandals that are going about among their respective sets, just as amusing a play as that of Sheridan’s would be presented, and one infinitely more disheartening.

I suppose that it has always been so. When good St. James of Jerusalem tells us that "the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature," he could not have arraigned it more thoroughly. And the same kind of indictment we find in all the ancient writings. It is in the third division of the *Inferno* that Dante has placed the fraudulent—both those who make and those who act a lie. Evil-speaking is a vice which seems to accompany civilization. It has been said that "half the world takes pleasure in inventing scandal, and the other half in believing it." It is the savage only that is exempt from this great sin. The North American Indian has a contempt for evil-speaking that we would do well to imitate.

Now, let me observe at the outset that though we lay much blame upon the tongue for the harm it does, that blame should not be laid so much upon this most useful member of the body, for the tongue only gives expression to the thoughts of the man within. It is with the tongue that we praise God, and with it that we speak evil of men. The wise old king has said, "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the is-

sues of life;" and our Lord has said, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." The heart, I take it, means, in these two texts, the actual temper and disposition of the man. As the man's temper and disposition are, so is the man himself; and he can always be judged by his expressions of word and deed.

Pursuing the subject a little further, let me point out to you that though man's first sin was disobedience—that is, a departing from the divine command—the first appearance of evil was the utterance of a lie; and it was a lie by insinuation. "Yea," said the serpent, "hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" "Why, surely it cannot be; He cannot be so mean," is the inference. The woman's answer was straight enough; and then came the lie direct: "Ye shall not surely die"—God knows better; and the woman was persuaded; and by a lie sin and death came into the world. And so it was that our Lord said, speaking of the devil, "that old serpent, which deceiveth the whole world;" that "he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the

father of it." The devil abode not in truth; it was not the thing he was; he did not think it, speak it, live it, and so he became a liar, and the creator of a lie. A lie is essentially at the bottom of all evil, as evil is a departure from the truth in thought and word and deed. *Per contra* truth is at the bottom of all goodness. Jesus said, "For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." It is a tremendous saying, told on the eve of His crucifixion. We must believe that it sums up His work—that is, that His work was to make the truth known. Again, He said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Now, "the way" is, we can see, really what He is in time; "the life" is what He is to those who accept Him in time; and "the truth" is what He is essentially. And so it has come about that truth is the great object of the search of all high souls—truth, the eternal basis of reason and emotion, as the same is perceived by the minds and hearts of men. And so, too, it has come about that men know that it is only those who are truthful who are to be revered; it is only they who can be followed.

"Thou must be true thyself,
If thou the truth wouldst teach;
Thy soul must overflow, if thou
Another's soul wouldst reach."

The advice of Polonius to his son is the epitome of wisdom. If truth, then, is so much to be valued, how base is a lie; how mean, how contemptible are those who follow it—who speak, who act falsely!

Now I do not intend to study with you the untruthfulness of men in all the affairs of life—in their family relations, in their business dealings; such a study would take me too far afield. I desire to bring before you simply the evil of speaking untruthfully; the dreadful sin of gossip and slander. It is everywhere conceded that speech is the great distinguishing mark of the superiority of the human race; yet, when we reflect how much of spite and malice and uncharitableness speech gives utterance to, we cannot help but blush for the use that men make of this great gift. Go into any gathering of men and women—no matter where—and what do you for the most part hear? Little stories about other men and women. And what do these stories consist of? Let us be candid. They consist for the most part of categories of the shortcomings, or of the supposed shortcomings, of men and women. Such utterances as these are everywhere heard: “Poor Mrs. So-and-so!

her husband has gone off to New York to amuse himself, and she so ill at home!" How does the world know but that "poor Mrs. So-and-so" sent her husband to New York because his presence in the city was required by family affairs? Or some one will say: "Poor Mr. So-and-so! I do so sympathize with him; it is too bad his wife spends so much on her gowns!" How does society know what funds her parents supply her with? But these are mild specimens of the things that gossips say and repeat. To paraphrase the words of St. Paul, "It is a shame even to speak of those things which they say are done of men in secret." Nor is it only the shortcomings, actual and imaginary, of friends and neighbors that are discussed—the things for which there may be some probable foundation; but untruthful things are said about men and women for which there is no groundwork—things which, as we say, "are made out of whole cloth."

In regard to the first class of story-tellers, one would say to the gossips and scandal-mongers, "Judge not after appearance, but judge righteous judgment;" or, better, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." It is a dreadful thing to under-

take to decide as to the conduct of our neighbors when we know so little of the reasons that have led them to take such or such a line of action. In regard to the second class of detractors and calumniators, one would say, "Beware lest ye come into the condemnation of Satan, when ye come before Him who has said to some of the race of mankind, 'Ye are of your father the devil.'"

Now the first class of evil-speaking people of whom I have spoken are actuated for the most part by no motive at all. They are mere tattlers; empty-headed, shallow-pated men and women, who gossip and retail slander to make themselves acceptable to people of their kind; who want to be considered interesting. These do not really intend to injure the people they asperse; and yet they do injure them. They injure them, sometimes, in the very worst way, for it is in a way from which they cannot, as a rule, be defended. There is an appearance of shortcoming, a basis for the slander; and as the people slandered know nothing about the story—or, if they do, cannot rush about and justify themselves to every man—the slander gains ground, and usurps the place of truth.

The second class of detractors and calumniators are undoubtedly actuated by despicable motives. They are gangrened by envy and hate. It is a pity to have to confess it. There are some men who cannot bear to hear their neighbors praised, so they set themselves to work to invent some story that will lower their heads. These are the people of whom David wrote when he said, "Adders' poison is under their lips." Every word they utter injures, and is intended to do so. Let me say that I do not think that this second class is so large as the first class of heedless, thoughtless slanderers; nor do I think that their evil-speaking is as dangerous as that of the first class. An absolute untruth is apt to be discovered, and the violence of an attack of envy and hate generally defeats itself. It is when there is an appearance of shortcoming, and the people who animadvert upon it are not considered to be envious, that the world stops and gives ear. The world, bad as it is, repudiates the spite and envy of the devilish; but it gives, oh, such a willing ear to those who simply tell of the foibles of men.

But besides these two classes of people, there is another that indulges in evil-speaking. It is

those who simply repeat what they have heard, who take up a story, as it were, at second hand. These are the drums and cymbals of the gossiping band. They are just as bad as those who first begin the slander, without having their wit and quick perception. But upon these poor chattering magpies I will not dwell.

This evil-speaking is one of the most dreadful of all sins. In the first place, it is so because it disseminates lies and supports the tottering strength of the kingdom of Satan. You must remember that the Greek word *διάβολος* meant first slanderer, then devil. In the second place, it is so because it injures a man in the most vital way. You all know the lines:

“Who steals my purse steals trash—’tis something, nothing;
’Twas mine, ’tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.”

You must remember, as I have often pointed out to you, that character—the attainment of character—is the end of all human endeavor; and in this both religion and philosophy agree. The slandering of men pulls down and destroys that thing which is most precious to them. You may say that it really does not destroy char-

acter, but only the estimation of it in the eyes of others. It is true, primarily, evil-speaking does only hurt the estimation of character—and this is bad enough; but too often its secondary effect is to lower the whole tone of the person injured, and to make him to be reckless of his acts; too often does the destruction of the estimation of character lead to the destruction of character itself. There are few men so strong who, when their friends fall off, and they know their characters are injured, have the strength to stand against the world. Besides, the estimation of a good man's character is his greatest worldly possession. It is the thing that secures him entrance into society. It is the thing upon which his success in business and in the professions is based. It is that which gives him the greatest sense of happiness in his intercourse with his kind.

Now you may ask me, Why have you brought this matter of evil-speaking before us for our consideration to-day? For this reason: that, as I have been told repeatedly, plague spots of gossip and scandal have broken out on the fair face of the city of Detroit. For some two years after I came here I heard nothing of such

things; but one cannot have lived in this town for three or four years and not have heard the most dreadful stories relating to "all sorts and conditions of men." I may say, and you may say, "I do not believe one half of what I hear, and upon this I take my stand;" but this stand is not sufficient. It is high time that you and I put our feet resolutely upon the story-tellers and said, "Avaunt, and quit my sight!"

And let me say to the people of Detroit that, if you do not resolutely stamp out the scandals that run like wild-fire through the homes of your city, and choke off the scandal-mongers, you will suffer the fair name of the community to be injured in a way that will cast reflection upon all. I speak of what I know. It is dreadful to hear the world at large speak of the evil-speaking that is current in Detroit. Besides, if you do not stamp out these scandals, you will by no means escape from accusation yourselves. When so much is said, and so much believed, of others, something evil may easily be said that will be believed of you. I tell you that gossip and slander are like witchcraft—they will attack even those who are highest and noblest in a community. But you may say, "I am sure

that some of these stories are true." Well, if they are, it is no reason why you, and such as you, should talk about them. You only make matters worse. But I hope to God that they are not true! If they are, may the people concerned blush for shame to think of the evil they have brought upon this community, as well as upon themselves, and be led to see what is right and endeavor to do it. But how are we to put this pestilence of evil-speaking down? Well, it is not so easy.

In the first place, we must cultivate the quality of magnanimity, of big-mindedness—the habit of seeing things from a wide and not from a narrow point of view. And there is only one way of becoming magnanimous, and that is to get the love of men in our hearts and the desire to do them good; and "love is ever long-suffering and kind; love envieth not, is not easily provoked; it thinketh no evil; it rejoiceth not in iniquity, but in the truth."

In the second place, we must acquire a liberal education; we must become cultured—that is, we must have our minds full of the true, the good, and the beautiful thoughts and actions of men, and our hearts full of love toward every

living soul. We will then be able to converse without talking about our neighbors. Ah, my friends, conversation is the greatest of all the arts of the world; it is so strange that it is so much neglected! And it is the thing that gives us the greatest pleasure; for all that we see and read and experience, we see and read and experience so that we may be able to tell our friends thereof. The point is to be able to do this without entering into personalities, either of others or of our own selves. And with this point we should associate another: the ability to enter into the talk of our friends; into what they have seen and read and experienced—the ability, in other words, to listen. If we will keep these two points in mind—that conversation is for the relating of things and for the hearing of things that we and others have seen and read and experienced, and not for the relating and hearing of matters concerning our neighbors' actions—we will be a long way on the road to become good conversationalists and to avoid evil-speaking. And yet let me observe that if conversation is considered to be merely an art, we will not arrive at any attainment of it. Art, when sought for art's sake, becomes

mannerism, stiff and formal. We should aim simply to please and to be pleased in the ways I have indicated; and if our hearts are clean, and we have a largeness of spirit, we will succeed without the aid of scandal.

And thus the tongue will be tamed. The tongue will never be tamed by order nor by any set of rules; it will be tamed only by the truthful heart that is kind; for "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." And thus it is that each time the tongue utters some low, mean, untruthful thing, it reveals the man within; and so we see, even as St. James has said, that it not only "setteth on fire the course of nature," but it "defileth the whole body" of him who utters the lie. And this is the condemnation of the slanderers: they are polluted by their own inventions; they become the associates of "sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters," of those who are shut without the gates of the Holy City of God.

VIII.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP.

“And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest; for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born.”—ACTS xxii. 25–28.

HEREIN, in this drama enacted at Jerusalem, in a city hateful to Rome, by a man who had already proclaimed himself to be a Jew of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, we see the wonderful power of the greatest talisman the world has ever known, *civis Romanus sum*—“I am a Roman citizen.” I do not care to enter upon the inquiry how it was that Saul of Tarsus acquired this great thing, the right of Roman citizenship. We know that the rights and powers of that citizenship were gradually extended by the Eternal City, first to the states of Italy, and then afterward to other districts through-

out the world, in whole or in part. It is probable that the father of the Apostle was made a Roman citizen because of some service rendered to Pompey or Antony, or perhaps to Cæsar himself. One thing we know: that Saul, or Paul, as we now call him, acquired this great right by birth.

I have learned, as I have studied and reflected concerning the affairs of life, to understand that there are no two things alike, and especially that there are no two periods of time so alike in their circumstances that we can say that they resemble each other; yet things have often a general likeness, and certain periods of time have so many things in common that we do not hesitate to compare them. The latest period of the Republic of Rome as it merges into the Empire, and this the second period of the Republic of the United States, have so many things in common that to a cursory examiner it might seem that the younger Republic is going the way of the older. (Let me say, however, in passing, that it is the things that these two periods have *not* in common that will, I am sure, prevent this *dénouement*.) On all the things common to the early Roman empire and

to our own Republic I will not dwell. I want to bring before you one thing only—this: that the right of Roman citizenship was considered in those old days the greatest dignity in all the world. It made the Romans the peers of the proudest nobles in every land. It gave them the right to stand in the presence of kings. It threw around them a shield that none dared to break down. It made them the rulers in the greatest empire the world had then, as yet, known. And so, to-day, the right of American citizenship makes us the equals of the heirs of all the titles of Europe. It makes us to be able to address every sovereign as of right. It throws around us a protection that the strongest nations hesitate to disregard. It makes us the rulers in the greatest of all the republics the world has ever known. But here the resemblance ends. The Roman bore his right of citizenship with dignity, as the highest of all earthly honors; the American bears his right of citizenship with disregard, as a thing that is of little worth.

My friends, I do not think that the American people understand—I am sure that you do not understand—that the right of American citizen-

ship is the source of most of the political rights of men throughout the world, and that it is the palladium of them all. Can you not see, as you read the history of this century—a century fraught with eternal consequences to the rights of men—that all peoples of the earth, as they have claimed, and do claim, greater and greater freedom for themselves, have turned their eyes to the great Republic, have conformed more and more to the pattern of things that we have here in the United States? Do you not understand that if the political rights of men should be permitted to fall to the ground in America they would soon be trampled in the dust by the profane and ambitious in all the countries of the world? Or is it that the American people—that you—understand these things, but that you have no care for them? Some men there are, indeed, who have no thought for such things as these; who take no interest in the rights of man; who are not even thankful for the conditions of freedom in which they live, by which they have been enabled to advance themselves and their affairs in the body politic; and these men, I am afraid, are on the increase. But there are others, thank God! who are thankful

for the dignity of American citizenship; who would die for the maintenance of the rights of men; who praise God each day for the glorious heritage that they enjoy; and these men, I am sure, will overcome the others, because they are positive and the others are negative, and an affirmation is always stronger than a negation.

Now, let me say that we speak of ourselves as of a sovereign people, and we consider each man to have a share in the great sovereign power of the nation; and this is undoubtedly so. All ultimate power resides with the people as a whole, and with no fraction or a part of them. The unreflecting may say, "I thought that it resided with the majority?" And so it does immediately, but ultimately it resides with the people as a whole; for the majority may change to a minority to-morrow, and the next day to a majority again. The sovereign power resides with the whole *people*. The majority merely express the wishes of the people, and that expression, for the while, dominates and controls. I think that the American people ought to get this great truth into their minds; and if they do so I am sure that many of the evils which attend upon party fealty will disap-

pear. It is one of the reasons for the abuse of power. Men look upon themselves in connection with their party rather than in relation to their citizenship; and so they desire the party in power, when that party is not their own, to fail, no matter what may be their and the people's loss as a whole. The men who are elected to office in the United States, from the highest to the lowest, should learn that they are to serve the people's rather than their party's interests; and I am sure that for the most part they would rather serve the people than party if it were not for the foolish bellicose attitude of partizans out of office.

As you and I are parts of the sovereign people, we share in their great power; and we share in the power of the sovereign people wherever it exists: in the councils of the nation, in those of the separate States, in those of the counties and towns, in administration, in legislation, in judicature, in the police power. The men who occupy the various positions in these separate departments of power occupy them by virtue of the will of the sovereign people, whose servants they are. They occupy them in virtue of your and of my will, expressed conjointly with that

of others; and they are your and my and others' servants. The government of and in the United States is representative, not because it is the best way, but because it is the only way that can be devised that will work; where so many citizens are sovereigns. The whole of the people cannot conveniently direct the administration of affairs; the whole cannot conveniently make the laws; the whole cannot sit on the benches of the courts; the whole cannot exercise the power of supervision and control; nor are the whole people always primarily concerned in especial affairs of government. So the whole power is divided up into parts, and these parts into parts again. Each part and part of parts elect and appoint their especial representatives for the many especial purposes of government. Yet behind each part and part of parts the whole people stand. I do not mean to say that the people stand immediately behind the whole and every part in the machinery of government as the same has been devised; but practically the people stand behind all power which is exercised in the land; and in case of abuse or failure of the use of power by any part, the sovereign people will intervene.

It is a glorious right and privilege, this, in which you and I share—power in and over sixty-five millions of people. Ah, my friends, what should be our feeling of responsibility toward this great thing! Now let me say that the feeling of responsibility we have toward any especial thing must be measured by the importance of the thing itself, and not by the number of people who share in the responsibility; for if it be measured by the number of people who share in the responsibility, where there is a great number, a great many might fall away and no harm be done. If many should fall away from exercising their rights in the sovereign power of the people of the United States, the people would, as a whole, be unable to express themselves; and it is the expression of the whole people that can determine what is to be done in any given case, the majority, as I have explained, voicing the expression. You have no right, by refusing to use your share in the sovereign power of the people, to defraud them out of the expression of your judgment. It is your bounden duty to exercise all the power which you have as a citizen—a duty which you owe not only to yourself as a man, but to the people as mankind.

Now I am sure you had in mind, as I said what I have said in regard to our responsibility toward the sovereign power of the people, the duty of all men who have the franchise to vote (I have this in mind, but I have far more than this); and you say to yourself, "What is the use of my voting, when the vote of an entirely ignorant Pole or Hun will have as much value as mine?" That is not the way to look at the matter. If the vote of the Pole or Hun is an ignorant one, you should do your best to neutralize it. But more: you should do your best to see that no more such ignorant votes be cast. You and such as you should use your share in the power of the land to see that no votes at all be cast except by those who understand what they are voting for; that intelligence be made everywhere the basis of the right to participate in the sovereign power; and you should see that this qualification of intelligence be applied as well to the native as to the foreign-born citizens of the United States.

And do not tell me that this great desideratum cannot be brought about! The American people are as keenly alive to the tendency of popular opinion as the weather-vanes to the prevail-

ing winds. If you and such as you will take the trouble to formulate and make such a demand upon the body politic, that body will respond; and it will see that its representatives in Washington or in Lansing, or wherever they may be, carry out its will by legislation. But mark, legislation will be of no value unless you and such as you see to it that its provisions are carried out. You and such as you must be willing to promote the ends of legislation even to the extent of taking office, and especially of taking the minor offices, and seeing that the law is carried out. I read not long ago of a manufacturing chemist of East London. His fellow-citizens desired that he should serve them as a member of some local board. To do so he would have to give up a business which he had made successful. He had made a fortune, and now the question came, Should he go on and acquire more wealth, or was it his duty, as he had acquired a competency, to serve the public? He chose to serve the public. What an example does this set the wealthy men of our own land!

It is a shame—a crying shame—that men, citizens of the United States, not only leave to the ignorant the power to vote, but that they suffer

them to vote for other ignorant men for so many of the offices in the gift of the people; that they calmly permit others more ignorant still to carry out (even to nullify) the wishes of the people; and so we, sovereigns of the United States, have come to such passivity that we speak of our legislatures and of Congress as not being willing to do this or that, when they should be compelled to do as the people will, or be thrown out. And it has come about that as we feel that Congress and the State legislatures do pretty much as they please, or as a body of rascally men hanging about them persuade them by threats and promises and money to do, we lose respect for the laws of the land, and when we can we shirk and evade them. I speak out of experience. Once upon a time, when I was a very young man, I was sent to one of the legislatures of one of our States. It was the saddest experience of my life. In and out, circling among the members of the Senate and Assembly, were hundreds of evil men with wrongful and often nefarious schemes, seeking to secure some legislation in their own or in their party's behalf, at no matter what harm or expense to the people at large. Among all these lobbyists there was scarcely a

man who was influenced simply by patriotic motives. If you, the people of the United States, permit the offices of government to be occupied by the ignorant and inexperienced (not to speak of the vicious), you should at least do what you can to uphold them in the right, and not let them become a prey for the ignoble band of lobbyists, who are worse than train-wreckers and bandits.

It is a dreadful state of affairs, this to which we have come. The people care but little for their laws. Take the laws of the land as applied to the customs. How many do not think it right to smuggle in a lot of things for the use of themselves and friends, and cheat the government? Take the tax laws as applied to personal property. How many there are who become borrowers at the time the assessment is made, or who buy things that cannot be taxed! How many, again, leave their actual domiciles—the place where their wealth was made, and wherein it is protected—and go to some little town and take up their residence there, so that they can escape their just share of the burden of their municipalities? This thing is done in New York and Boston as well as in Detroit. It is no answer to say that the municipal taxes are greater than

they ought to be, when this the intelligent class of citizens have the remedy in their own hands. If there are abuses in the government of their cities, let them take hold and reform the same.

How many men, do you think, if we should have an income tax, will give in a true statement of their incomes? * When we had an income tax, some thirty years ago, it was the men with fixed and ascertained salaries who paid the larger taxes—not the great millionaires. It is shameful—this state of affairs, this lack of patriotism, this unwillingness to suffer somewhat for the good of the whole; and it all springs out of the selfishness of the intelligent class of the land. They neglect their duties, and give over the control of affairs to ignorance and often to vice, in order that they may have more time to devote to the pursuit of wealth and the pleasures that wealth brings. Then, as a certain amount of injustice is done them (as well as to others, by the way), they sulk, and seek to avoid the consequences of their selfishness and folly by ways which, to say the least, are devious. Oh, I am sick and tired of the pusillanimity of these men—grumblers and hypocrites!

* This sermon was preached May 27, 1894.

Occasionally, it is true, men of this class do take some part in some department of the power of the people; but herein comes the trouble. The men of intelligence, as a rule, enter the arena of politics (as we say) for the purpose of wealth. This is not always true; but my experience leads me to aver that it is generally true. Their ends are not much elevated above the ends of the rest of the class to which they belong. And then, too, they become ambitious; they want always to be climbing up the political ladder; and so they look more at the rung above them than at the place where they stand and the duties that devolve upon them therefrom. Again, they use their power, often, that they may promote schemes in which they or their friends are interested. Can you blame people that they do not trust them? Let intelligence enter politics for patriotic motives, and I tell you it *will* rule. It is the natural order in the kingdoms of men and of God.

What I say is that intelligence should enter politics with the simple desire to do good; and when it shall do so fully, the cause of good government will be gained. Ah, I say to you, my brethren, arouse yourselves, arouse your fellow-

men; and if you cannot arouse them, arouse the *women*! There are so many things which need correction by legislation. Every periodical you take up speaks to you of them; every journal tells you of some new union or society or association that has been formed to promote the social amelioration of the people: to put down the sweating system, the low tenement-house, the evil saloon; to prevent the labor of little children; to enforce a living wage to the lonely woman. There are so many things, too, which need only good administration to reform. The laws are for the most part good enough; the trouble is that they are not carried out. Give over the desire for gain and wealth and pleasure. Look to the first great citizens of this land. These men gained wealth; but they gave not their whole thought to it, but only a part. Their heart's desire was the welfare and honor of their country.

You may say, "Yes, but all men cannot take office; some have got to be content with exercising simply their right of suffrage." True, all men cannot take office; but no man should be content simply to exercise his right of suffrage. If all men cannot take office in an honest and

good government, all men can help to formulate and express views and sentiments that will uphold those who have taken office. And this it is every man's duty to do. Ah, you do not understand the strength of public opinion in the affairs of the country, and yet it is the greatest and chiefest of all powers. It is, indeed, the only power that can keep the ship of state true, pointing ever on her right course, upward and onward. See what public opinion has done here, in this our city, in regard to the High School site! Public opinion is as much the life of the nation as the Spirit of God is the life of man. By it alone can people be lifted out of the greed of gain; by it alone can the evils of intemperance be eradicated; by it alone can the fetters of selfishness be broken; by it alone can men be made to see what are their duties to mankind and the state.

But how shall public opinion be formed? By your and such as your speech and acts—in meetings, in private conversation, in the public press, in books. And how shall I get my opinion that will go to make up public opinion? There are many sources. There are papers, books, and articles innumerable. But the greatest source is

the source whence all these spring—the life of Jesus Christ, as applied to the present every-day affairs of men ; applied not in the narrow bigotry of religionism, but in the broad liberty of Him who consorted with all men of all conditions, and who appealed to the best that was in them.

Arouse ye, oh, arouse ye, ye careless citizens of the land ! Sell not your birthright for a mess of pottage, no matter how good it may taste.

IX.

GOOD GOVERNMENT.

“They brought unto Him a penny. And He saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto Him, Cæsar’s. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.”—MATT. xxii. 19–21.

My purpose this morning is to speak to you on the most important of all subjects of the day—Good Government.

I spoke to you last spring on Good Citizenship, and incidentally touched on my present subject; for it is impossible to speak of the one without reference to the other. Yet they are different, even as constitutional law and politics are different. Constitutional law looks at the state from the standpoint of its form and order; politics looks at the state from the standpoint of its rise and evolution. And so good government has regard to the state from the standpoint of the men who govern; good citizenship from the standpoint of those who are governed.

Let me clear the ground for my subject by

first pointing out to you that there are many theories as to how the state arose; because, as I shall show, our idea of good government depends upon the theory we hold as to the way the state came into existence. I cannot enter upon a discussion of all these theories; it is not necessary. It is sufficient to say that, generally speaking, four theories have been held, viz., the theory of brute power, the theory of contract, the theory of family relationship, the theory of theocratic foundation.

1. The theory of brute power maintains that the state is the work of the conquest of the weak by the strong. It asserts that might makes right. It has a plausible look, and has had many friends, especially among heartless despots and fanatic revolutionists. Yet it is evident that it is not correct, because it regards the state as held together simply by force, and leaves no room for moral relations and responsibilities. If the theory of brute power were correct, then there could be no place for the idea of law commanding respect outside of its rewards and penalties.

2. The theory of contract, since Rousseau wrote his "*Contrat Social*," has been very popu-

lar, chiefly in republican countries. It asserts that the state is the free work of a contract entered into by its citizens. This theory has been most pleasing to the little political philosophers, because it flatters their feeling of importance, making them to feel that each one of them is a founder of a state, and that that state exists only by his will and consent. The theory would be admirable if all men were devoted to good government, and sought only its ends; but since all men are not devoted to good government, and seek their own as often as the ends of the state, and yet would, if this theory were correct, have a right to say that the state should not exist but by their will and consent, it works badly; it leads to the dread terror of anarchy. Besides, history tells us that this theory is absurd, for it starts with the premise that men have been as they are now, and we know that our immediate ancestors were uncouth barbarians, and our far-off progenitors more like animals than men.

3. And so we come to an examination of the third theory—that the state arose by reason of family relationship. “The effect of the evidence derived from comparative jurisprudence,” says Maine, in “Ancient Law,” “is to establish that

view of the primeval condition of the human race which is known as the Patriarchal Theory." In support of this theory there comes in on the one side the evidence of the Scriptures—evidence that may be called religious; and on the other side there comes in the evidence of ancient codes—evidence that may be called legal. The points in support of this theory which lie on the surface of history, both scriptural and non-scriptural, are these: The eldest male parent is absolutely supreme in his household. His dominion extends to life and death, and is as unqualified over his children as over his slaves. The flocks and herds of the children are the flocks and herds of the father; and the possessions of the father, which he holds in a representative rather than in a proprietary character, are equally divided at his death among his descendants, the eldest son receiving merely a double share.

"Archaic law . . . is full in all its provinces of the clearest indications that society in primitive times was not what it is assumed to be—a collection of *individuals*; in fact, and in view of the men who composed it, it was an *aggregation of families*." And it is in this way that Professor Drummond speaks in the book that we have all

been reading—"The Ascent of Man": "Almost from the very first, indeed, the Family, and not the individual, must have been the unit of Tribal life; and as Families grew more and more definite, they became the recognized piers of the social structure, and gave a first stability to the race of men." "The Family is not only its [evolution's] greatest creation, but its greatest instrument for further creation."

4. And lastly, a word in regard to the theory of theocratic foundation. I maintain that it is out of the fact that the family is the unit of the state, and not because God can be presumed to have raised single men above the condition of others, and to have given them especial powers, that it can and should be said that all power and authority is of God. I mean that God, who is our Father, and treats men always as living in families, can never be said to have instituted and to have maintained the state, except as it is the expansion of a single family into many correlated ones, into an organism that is now held together by the family idea! It is only because of this fact that we can understand the words of St. Paul that seemed to support the authority of vile Nero: "Let every soul be subject unto the

higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God."

The state, then, let us accept as proven, rests upon the theory of family relationship; and let us believe that it is because of this that God is the upholder of the state. If we accept this theory as a fact, we can see at once what should be the conduct of the governors toward the governed; how they should regard their duties toward them. The great trouble with the present condition of affairs is that the governors—that is, those who are in the positions of power—regard the state as a mass of individuals having no relation to one another, and their duty as imperative to themselves as to others. And this trouble, I affirm, has arisen greatly through the prevalence of the contract theory of the rise of a state, which postulates that the state deals with individuals, and not with families. When the people of the United States shall rise to a conviction that they are one great family, and that the executive power is as a father to them, to look after their interests with paternal care; when they shall decree that the courts of law shall judge according to what is right in a great family; when they shall impress upon their rep-

representatives the principle of considering all the members of the nation alike, of which if one suffers all shall suffer, then and then only shall we have good government. The governors in the United States always follow the leading of the governed; these last have only to express their will clearly and emphatically, and that will will prevail.

Let me repeat, the whole trouble with the present state of government in the United States arises through the fact that men regard the individual as the unit of the state, and not the family; consequently the state is treated as an aggregation of individuals, of which some may prosper and some may suffer without loss to the body politic; consequently, too, the state in its laws and in its life has no consideration for the family, and the many and loving relationships that spring out of the family idea, but only for the individual and his duties. And the individual, thrust out of a family organism, behaves toward the state and toward its citizens as an Ishmaelite, having a hand against every man.

Let me now bring my assertion into touch with life, and examine how this theory would work if carried into practice. And first, then,

let us look at how the theory would work in our cities and towns. In the towns, indeed, the idea of family has never been entirely lost to view, as all the citizens thereof come together from time to time to discuss common affairs. But in the cities the idea has been lost sight of. Cities have grown so large that it is impossible for all of their electors to come together anywhere at any one time; so a system of representation has been adopted. A city has a mayor, who is elected by the whole city at large; and it has several aldermen, who are elected by precincts or wards. Other officers are often elected, such as school commissioners and judges of the criminal courts. But the municipal power is presumed to be vested in the mayor as the chief executive, and in the board of aldermen as the principal legislative body of the city.

What I assert is this: the mayor should look upon himself as standing in the place of a father to the city which he governs; as having no care for party, no ambition for himself, no intention but that of doing his duty as the father of a family. And if men could be elected who would have such an ideal of their place and power, much would be done to solve all the hard ques-

tions of municipal government. I am sure that the many ways that have been devised of shearing the mayor of his prerogatives by the multiplication of independent boards and commissions would disappear, and thereout would come the unity in municipalities that is so much desired. As it is at present, the mayor of the city and the members of its various boards and commissions seem to be always at cross-purposes. They wage an unending internecine war. I contend that the members of all executive boards and commissions should be appointed by the mayor without confirmation, and that they should be directly responsible to him, the mayor himself being responsible to the people.

If the mayor would consider himself to be, and to act as, the chief father of the city, the greatest good would come; and even if the mayor should not consider himself to be simply the father, even then, I aver, it would be far better to put the responsibility for government directly upon him than to divide it up and parcel it among bureaus and departments. The people should be able to see who is to blame for the maladministration of their affairs, as well as able to give credit for good government.

Some check could be devised, through the board of aldermen and the courts, by which the mayor could be brought to book for wrong-doing. If the mayoralty were exalted to such a position of power and dignity, surely the best citizens could be induced to stand for it—that is, when the best people of the community desired them to do so. And these same things can be said of the board of aldermen as of the mayor. All the legislative power of the various other boards and commissions should be lodged in their hands, and therewith many other diversified rights and interests that are now scattered under various heads. The office of alderman should be magnified as much as possible, and the aldermen should be taught to feel that they are not “city fathers” only in name, but in fact; and so the best citizens would soon be induced to stand for the place of alderman.

Why, my friends, it is this simple thing that made the people of Holland great—this, I say: that all men in power looked upon themselves as standing in the place of fathers to the people, from William the Silent to the simplest burgo-master and schepen in the land. What I aver is this; that in our cities (outside of the judicial

power, which must be lodged in the courts) all power should be vested directly in either the mayor or in the board of aldermen; and all commissions and boards, of whatsoever kind, should be their committees and appointees. Now you may say that this is antidemocratic; I deny it. The mayor and the aldermen are to be elected by the people, and they are directly responsible to them. The nearer you get to the people—that is, the more immediate the exercise of power is in its relation to the body that confers it—the more democratic is the government. The trouble now is that the exercise of power is so cut up and confused that the men who have it do not feel that they are in contact with the people at all; therefore that they are not their creatures and servants.

To bring about this simple thing would be very easy. There are many good citizens in the land; many men who are capable of giving to the cause of good government and social morality the same devotion that they now give to the cause of money-making. The thing that hinders them and keeps them out of active participation in municipal affairs is the play of party politics, and the knowledge that even if they should be

elected to some office, they would be almost powerless, and be placed between so many cross-fires of direction that they would inevitably make mistakes. You have but to centralize the direction as I have shown, in the first place; and, in the second, you have to drop out party politics in municipalities; and the cause of good government is gained. It is utterly ridiculous that because men are Democratic and inclined to free trade, or Republican and inclined to protection, they should therefore find themselves on different sides in regard to the proper management of their respective cities. And the dropping of party politics out of municipalities will not only aid to secure good men for office, but it will do something more: it will weaken the power of the caucus; yes, eventually it will destroy it, for caucuses thrive only when party politics thrive; and caucuses are the curse of the country. Drop party politics out of municipal affairs, and no man would feel himself to be bound by the nomination of a caucus; eventually, I believe, no party nominations would be made.

But I go further, and say that it is just as ridiculous to have party politics in State as in

municipal affairs. I was educated a lawyer, as you know, and was once a member of the New Jersey legislature; and I assure you that with the exception of the questions touching office, when elections were to be made on the joint ballot of the Senate and the House, there was no more reason for party politics in the legislature than there is for them in the Territory of Alaska. And I propose a very simple remedy for the eradication of this evil in State legislatures; it is this: let the senators of the United States be elected by the people of the several States, and not by their representatives. I know that there are some who affirm that this plan is revolutionary—notably Senator Edmunds, in the December * number of the *Forum*. But what of it? Many other revolutionary things have been done in our government since the Constitution was formed. The reason why I think that this change is desirable is this: At present the man who wants to be senator gets his henchmen to run the caucuses in the various electoral districts of the State in favor of men favorable to himself. Then he gives a good round contribution to the sum of money raised by partizans to

elect these men over their adversaries. Then he and his friends say to their fellow-citizens of their party, "You must vote for the man nominated by our party, for that means one vote more for our party in the election of a senator of the United States." Then (if the men who were nominated and were supported by the senatorial aspirant be elected to office) he, through his agent, goes to them and says: "I nominated you; I contributed a sum of money toward your election expenses; I stirred up the whole party in your favor; you are in duty bound to vote for me for senator." And so a double wrong is done: the free representatives of the people do not elect the senators of the United States, as it was intended that they should do when the Constitution was formed; and men who ought to have been elected with a simple view to legislating for State affairs are really elected to elect the United States senators; and the State suffers.

I shall not attempt, in the short time that is left me, to consider what good government should be in the State and in the general government of the United States. I desire, however, to say one thing, and that the same that I have said in regard to municipal government: that, as much

as possible, there should be a concentration of power and of responsibility, with as close a nexus as can be made between the source and the exercise of power. This simple thing, and a non-partizan civil service, will accomplish much for the great cause we have at heart.

Let me add one word of advice and admonition to you as governors as well as governed. Do not think that the officers elected by you for various places exercise the whole of the power of the people. They each exercise but a small part of it, in fact, though jointly they exercise a great deal. Still the power of the State—that is, the sovereign power—is never wholly delegated; much of it remains always with the people—first in the ballot, then in the jury system, then in direct interference, and then in influence. Of the duty of every elector to cast his ballot I shall not speak to-day. I have spoken of this paramount duty on another occasion. Of the duty of every citizen to attend upon the courts, and to take his share of jury duty, I cannot speak too strongly. Who does not know that the jury system of to-day is considered to be a failure? And who does not know that the cause for this failure lies primarily at the door of the intelligent classes?

They shirk this duty continually, averring that their several businesses are of much more importance than the maintenance of justice and the preservation of the life of the State; and so, as all men know, a venal, corrupt class of men are drawn on the panels—men that can often be tempted to swerve from the right by the bribes of the “jury-fixers.”

It has been alleged during the past month by a well-known member of the Detroit bar that not a single prominent criminal has been convicted and punished here for many years past. “Bad,” says he, “as the government of the city of New York is (and apparently there is none worse on the earth), whenever the pursuit of any criminal, whatever his prominence or position, has been earnestly undertaken, he has been driven into the penitentiary; but here in Detroit there is such lax public opinion that juries do not seem willing to convict whenever any show of defense is made.” What is wanted here is simply a willingness of the best citizens (if they can be called best) to sacrifice somewhat of their interests for the public good. The example set by the aged Hon. Hamilton Fish, who had served his State and the United States in the highest official posi-

tions, yet who never shirked his duty as a juror, should commend itself to all true-hearted Americans, and shame the selfish men who wriggle out of this great exercise of the power of the people!

Of the duty of direct interference of citizens in the government of their country I cannot speak at length, for I should have to enter upon details that would weary you; but let me point out to you that when you have cast your ballot and served upon juries you have not by any means exhausted your power and done your whole duty as a citizen. You should constantly interfere with and correct anything and everything that you see to be wrong. You perceive what I mean. As you are not a part of the government—that is, of the machinery of government—it will not be your duty to see that right is carried into effect. It will always be your duty to see that right is put in motion to be made effective; and out of this arises a great deal of our present difficulty. Men cast their ballots and go home and say, “Now let the elected look to the condition of the city and State, and do all things that are necessary for good government; the responsibility is upon them.” But it is not so; the responsibility

is upon them to a great extent, but it is upon you too; and it is because you shirk your share of responsibility that the office-holders so often do as they please. What is wanted is a determination upon the part of all good citizens that the laws shall be carried into effect, and a willingness to set the machinery of the laws in motion; for the laws of the land are, as a rule, good and beneficent.

And really this is precisely what Dr. Charles Parkhurst did in New York. He saw, even as you can see, that the laws were constantly evaded, and he got evidence to show it. Then he set to work to induce the governing powers in the city to do their duty. He found that they had so long evaded it that they were wasting with atrophy. And then came in the Lexow Committee of inquiry into the ways of municipal government in New York. Its revelations of crime and the protection of crime have astonished the world. Now suppose you start to work in the same way, and take up something that strikes you as being wrong—the flashy pictures on the bill-boards throughout Detroit, for instance. You will soon find that you will get so deep in the mud of horrid and obscene pic-

tures and literature that you will want to draw back; but if you and such as you follow up the cue and work it with all your energy, and then get the machinery of government to act, you will do a great thing for the cause of morality, and your duty. And you will have exercised part of the power of your citizenship.

Lastly, let me speak of the duty of the governed to exercise their influence with the governors. This is something that goes hand in hand with direct interference, but it is not exactly the same thing. It is the force of the denunciation of wrong and of the unceasing support of right exercised in a community. Ah, my friends, how seldom is it exercised! How seldom will men, even when they are leaders in a city or State, stand up for the great principles of morality, when party success or personal preferences come into play! We have recently had a most glaring exhibition of this sort of moral obtuseness in the city of Detroit. I blush to think of it, and I fear for its effect upon the youth of our community.

One word in conclusion, and I have done. The subjects of good citizenship and good government are the prime subjects of thought and

endeavor throughout the length and breadth of the land. This we all know as we read and listen to the words that come to us from every platform and press. But let me assure you that all the words that will and can be uttered, all the machinery that will and can be devised, will be of no avail, unless there arises in the hearts of the people of the United States a consciousness of shortcoming and a determination to do their duty, and their whole duty, toward God and man. God grant that such a consciousness and such a determination may arise! God grant that the great Republic may yet have sons and daughters that shall be worthy of her; that shall not hesitate, if it need be, to protect her life at the sacrifice of their own, much less of a portion of their time and efforts! For this is all that good government demands of the men and the women who love truth and righteousness: that they devote a fair portion of their time and efforts to the cause of the State.

X.

THE SOCIAL EVIL AND THE LOW SALOON.

“Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness.”—ROM. xiii. 13.

THERE are two great heads of the many-headed hydra of evil that threaten the present generation of men, which if they could be cut off and destroyed would relieve the body politic of the fear it has for its ultimate salvation. I allude to the social evil, so called, and the low saloon. We find that they are discussed continually from the platform and in the press, and all sorts of answers are given to the problems how they shall be solved. I do not pretend to be able to give the right answers, yet I think that I may be able to throw some light upon the answers that will help you to understand the questions better, and will induce you to work harder for their solution.

In the first place, we must understand that both the social evil and the low saloon rest upon things which are not evils *per se*. It is evident

that the social evil does not, when it rests upon the common division of life into sex, which division runs through all nature. And it is equally evident that the low saloon does not, when it rests upon the common desire of men for stimulants, which desire received its approbation in the first miracle that was wrought by Christ in the marriage supper at Cana of Galilee, and (I say it with reverence) in the last supper partaken of by Him and His disciples in "the upper chamber" in Jerusalem.

But let me treat each of these two great problems separately; for though they are so often associated together, they are not alike in character. The association is accidental, and arises out of the fact that the social evil flourishes greatly in low saloons.

How can the social evil be prevented? Well, in the first place, let us look at the causes which produce it. What are they? Ignorance and want. You may say, "Not always." No, not always on the part of men; but on the part of women it is rare that the causes for the evil that destroys them are any other than I have mentioned—ignorance and want. Some few women may be naturally vicious, but not many. And

this very viciousness arises greatly out of coarse ignorance allied with horrid want. And what, for the most part, is the cause of ignorance and want? Low and insufficient wages.

It is impossible to blink it, my friends: the wages that are paid to working-women—except to the very few—are radically low, and utterly insufficient to sustain them in decency and respectability. I shall not bring before you an array of statistics; every newspaper and every magazine of any standing has during the past twenty years presented statistics showing the low rate of wages that are paid to women.

“It is estimated,” says Jacob A. Riis, in his chapter on the working-girls of New York in “How the Other Half Lives,” “that at least one hundred and fifty thousand women and girls earn their own living in New York; but there is reason to believe that this estimate falls far short of the truth when sufficient account is taken of the large number who are not wholly dependent upon their own labor, while contributing by it to the family’s earnings. These alone constitute a large class of the women wage-earners; and it is characteristic of the situation that the very fact that some need not starve on their wages con-

demns the rest to that fate. The pay they are willing to accept all have to take. What 'the everlasting law of supply and demand,' that serves as such a convenient gag for public indignation, has to do with it one learns from observation all along the road of inquiry into these real woman's wrongs. To take the case of the saleswoman for illustration: The investigation of the Working-women's Society disclosed the fact that wages averaging from \$2.00 to \$4.50 a week were reduced by excessive fines, 'the employers placing a value upon time lost that is not given to services rendered.' . . . The practice prevailed in some stores of dividing the fines between the superintendent and the timekeeper at the end of the year. In one instance they amounted to \$3000, 'and the superintendent was heard to charge the timekeeper with not being strict enough in his duties.'

"Sixty cents is put as the average day's earnings of the one hundred and fifty thousand; but into this computation enters the stylish 'cashier's' two dollars a day, as well as the thirty cents of the poor little girl who pulls threads in an East Side factory; and, if anything, the average is too high. Such as it is, however, it rep-

resents board, rent, clothing, and 'pleasure' to this army of workers. Here is the case of a woman employed in the manufacturing department of a Broadway house; it stands for a hundred like her own. She averages \$3.00 a week; pays \$1.50 for her room; for her breakfast has a cup of coffee; lunch she cannot afford; one meal a day is her allowance." The Workingwomen's Society reported at a great public meeting in New York some three years ago: "It is a known fact that men's wages cannot fall below a limit upon which they can exist, but woman's wages have no limit, since the paths of shame are always open to her. It is simply impossible for any woman to live without assistance on the low salary a saleswoman earns, without depriving herself of real necessities. . . . It is inevitable that they must in many instances resort to evil."

This, I say, is the great cause of the want that leads to evil—insufficient wages. And this is the great cause of the ignorance, too, that does not know how to protect itself; for the young girls of New York and other cities are sent out to work before they have become women and learned of the ways of life and of their duty toward God and man. They are utterly without

safeguards—often, indeed, without any instruction regarding the dangers of yielding to temptation. Girls should be sent to school and kept there at least until they are sixteen years of age; and in the last years of their school life competent instructors—men and women of character, who have taken degrees in medicine and philosophy—should teach them the things that they ought to know. And in this instruction the beauty of virtue should be dwelt upon, and the hideousness of vice. Vice, stripped of its showy robes and of the mystery with which prudes have surrounded it, would soon lose all attraction for young women. And I believe that if it were so exposed it would soon lose all attraction for young men too. Boys should be instructed even as girls should be, and they should be warned against the devices of the “strange woman, whose feet go down to death; whose steps take hold on hell,” and exalted to care for the “virtuous woman, whose price is far above rubies.” And above all, they should be taught that their first duty to the race is to shield all women from harm.

But before we leave the question of insufficient wages, let me say that it is evident that if

this is, in the last analysis, the thing which pushes young women along the road to destruction, it is just as much to blame in pushing young men the same way. There is no doubt that, for the most part, if young men could earn enough to support wife and family, they would do so. All men, except the very few perverted, are of a domestic disposition, and have enshrined in their hearts a love of home, in which some woman shall shine as a lamp radiating light and hopefulness, routing darkness and despair. Men are bad enough, but they are not as bad as they are painted. They are as often the victims of evil circumstances as the makers of evil conditions. Whatever may be the attitude of the men of the Latin countries toward women, that of the men of America is one of respect and admiration. Again, if men were paid higher wages, the ignorance and want of the women who are paid insufficient wages would appeal to their higher nature, and they would respond to every call that was made to protect and care for the victims of evil. We believe that the men whom we call gentlemen respond to every such call. I believe that it is no less true of the men whom we know simply as working-men. I read to you

one of the six additions to the platform of the National Labor Union adopted since 1868: "*Resolved*, That women are entitled to equal pay for equal services with men; that the practice of working women and children ten to fifteen hours a day at starvation prices is brutal in the extreme, and subversive to the health, intelligence, and morality of the nation, and demands the interposition of law."

Insufficient wages I regard as the primary cause of the social evil, and ignorance and want as the secondary. Yet there is another cause, which, though it does not produce the evil, tends to aggravate it; and that is the hardness of heart of those who, having never felt the power of these dreadful servants of Satan, have never fallen into this social wrong. It is curious how hard reputable women are on the disreputable, and how seldom they will give their erring sisters an opportunity of raising themselves out of their horrid condition. There are hundreds—yes, thousands—of women who would gladly leave the dreadful life they lead, if the way of escape were open. I know that there are rescue-houses and the like, but there are not enough of them, nor is there enough interest

taken in them by women generally. I was told not long ago that the guardian of one of the houses of refuge in New York had many more applications for places than could be accommodated, and that again and again God's children had begged to be permitted to sleep on a table or in a chair. We should remember that though a woman may be one of the victims of evil, she need not, by any means, be utterly bad; our Lord Himself said, speaking to the proud priests and Pharisees of His day—and we who are so satisfied with our righteousness might well take His words to heart—"Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you."

"Then gently scan your brother man;
Still gentler, sister woman."

Yes, gently scan your brother man, and gentler, sister woman; "judge not, that ye be not judged." But whatever your judgment be, visit upon the man the same penalty you do upon the woman. I am not an admirer of the books of Mrs. Sarah Grand, but I am sure that the principle she has laid down in "The Heavenly Twins" is right.

But what can be done to remedy or narrow

the borders of the social evil apart from the giving of higher wages and of better instruction to young women and young men? Well, I have thought of two things. First, I would advise that all property be held accountable for any and every unlawful use to which it may be put; and that, when there shall be found upon any premises a house of ill repute, a heavy penalty be imposed upon the property, and, at the same time, the name of the owner, unless he can clear his skirts of all knowledge of wrong, be published in the newspapers at his expense. Secondly, I would advise the formation of a company of female police. They should be recruited from among widows of a mature age, and have the same powers that male policemen have. I would not have them carry weapons, nor would I have them use force on any occasion, but only moral persuasion. When force should be required they should call upon the men for help. I believe that a little company of vigorous, virtuous female police would do more in a few short years to close up bad houses, gambling-dens, and low saloons than all the male members of the police force have done for centuries. And I do not think that this scheme is visionary and wild.

Women have for many years managed the reform school for women in Massachusetts, and in New York it has been suggested lately, under the reform movement, that a woman should be appointed a member of the Department of Charities and Correction. The present mayor of New York, it is said, has expressed himself in favor of the representation of women in the city government; and if in the city government and in the Department of Charities and Correction, why not in the Department of Police? In this connection I desire to call your attention to the fact that one of the greatest contests waged by the labor associations with the constituted authorities was over the question whether women should not be appointed as factory inspectors. Since the time they have been so appointed the very best results have come from their work.

But I must pass on to an examination of the other great head of the hydra of evil—the low saloon. And mark, I speak of the low saloon, and not of the saloon in general; because I think that a distinction ought to be made between the respectable selling of good liquors, wines, and beer, whether wholesale or retail, and the disreputable selling of bad beer and poisonous bev-

erages. Let us be fair: there is no difference between the manufacture and the sale of liquors and other beverages, and there is no difference between the selling of the same by retail and by wholesale. If one of these things be wrong, all are wrong. If one be right, all are right. Nor do I see any difference between him who manufactures or sells and him who drinks. Now I maintain that the manufacture and sale of intoxicants are not evils *per se*, but that they are likely to become so. It is the likelihood of their becoming so that makes us to scan them critically, that makes us to restrict them more than other trades and businesses; for we must understand that all trades and businesses are under some restrictions in every well-regulated community. I know that when I say that I maintain that the manufacture and sale of stimulating beverages are not evils *per se*, I may run counter to the conclusions of the Committee of Fifty (of which President Low of Columbia College is the chairman), which has lately been appointed to study and to report on the liquor problem; but I do not believe that I shall. I take my stand on the common experience and common consensus of men of all generations,

and on the principle of the Church Temperance Societies of England and America, which, though they encourage total abstinence, preach godly temperance. And this stand I take without appeal to the acts of our Lord when He was with His friends and disciples, and to the well-known advice that St. Paul gave to St. Timothy. What I aver is that the use of intoxicants easily becomes an abuse, and that, therefore, the manufacture and sale thereof should be hedged in and surrounded by every possible safeguard.

Let us begin with the manufacture. And here, in my opinion, is the point of departure for the reform of the liquor and beer traffic. No manufacture of intoxicants can take place to-day without a license and the payment of certain taxes. And the license and the taxes are right, but they do not go far enough. No manufacture of liquor or beer, or even of wine, should be permitted except under governmental inspection and regulation; and the first task of the government should not be to get revenue in taxes, but to see to it that the manufacture of intoxicants is done properly and with the least possible probability of harm. Why, it is the present inspection and regulation of distilling

and brewing that has made the manufacture of whisky and beer respectable in the Dominion of Canada. At the opening of the offices of the firm of Hiram Walker & Sons last autumn, the best and most respectable citizens of Ontario and Michigan were present. I would have the manufacturers of all sorts of intoxicants put up all their products in packages, great and small, which should be delivered with unbroken seals to the retail dealers; and would permit the middlemen, under like governmental inspection and regulation, to bottle only foreign liquors and wines. A great deal of the present trouble, I am told, comes from the middlemen—the rectifiers, or, better, falsifiers—adulterating the goods that they buy or that are consigned to them; and in the adulteration making them tenfold more deadly than they were. Again, I am sure we will agree that no liquors, wine, or beer should be put on the market by the distiller, brewer, or wine-producer, except such as are absolutely pure and wholesome, and then only at such an age as will make them best for use; and from this rule there should be no departure. It is a dangerous thing for men to drink liquors that have just been distilled; and it is equally danger-

ous to drink fresh-made beer that has to be gotten ready for the market by the aid of noxious chemicals.

But how are the governmental regulations and inspections to be carried out? Easily enough: by men who have been graduated from the best colleges and universities in the land, or, better, by men who shall have been graduated from some great agricultural and polytechnical school to be established by the general government. The United States has its school for the army at West Point, and that for the navy at Annapolis; it is high time that it established a school of the sciences in some part of the West. And such a school, let me say in passing, would do a great deal to solve the important question of civil-service reform.

But as yet I have only touched upon the manufacture and sale of intoxicants at wholesale; for let me say, I would keep each branch of the trade as separate and distinct as possible. The manufacturer should be permitted to sell either to the middlemen or to the retailers, but, as I have said, always in sealed packages; and the middlemen should be permitted to sell only to the retailers or to householders, and always in

original packages, except in the case of foreign goods. And both the manufacturers and the middlemen should be prohibited, under forfeiture of their licenses, from having any interests, direct or indirect, in any branch of the business other than their own. One of the greatest sources of our present trouble is that brewers and distillers and middlemen set up men in trade by lending them money on chattel mortgages and the like; thus they get control of their businesses and force them to buy their stock, and often more of it than they otherwise would, thus forcing the retailers in turn to encourage their customers to drink. There are several cities with whose affairs I am familiar, in the East, that are controlled by the brewers and distillers thereof; and I suppose the same is true of some of the cities of the West. The brewers and distillers, by the means of which I have spoken, get control of the low saloons; these low saloons get control of their customers, and conjointly they control the caucuses and party politics.

Now we come to the question of license, and what shall it be—high or low? And the answer must be, it seems to me, high license, but not so

high as to act as a stimulus to law-breakers to set up illicit houses. The amount of license should be simply a guaranty that the dealer and the land-owner intend to run their place of business legally and respectably; and guaranty, and not revenue, should determine the amount to be fixed for the license. And I would have three licenses for the retail trade—one for beer, one for wine, and one for liquors—and make men take out one, two, or three, and for each pay the required sum and give the proper bond. I would let them run together in some cases, but there should be no confusion.

The chief means of reform of the retail liquor traffic which I advocate are these: First, general governmental inspection and regulation, the same as for the manufacture and the wholesale trade. When any intoxicants have been tampered with there should be an irrevocable forfeiture of the license. Second, I would have the house licensed as well as the dealer, and for any infraction of the law and the governmental regulations I would have the license revoked both as to the dealer and the landlord. I would have the alleged infraction passed upon by a competent court, and its judgment to be as irrevocable as any adjudi-

cated case. Third, I would have all public places—clubs, hotels, saloons, and the rest—treated alike, and every place closed punctually at twelve o'clock midnight, and not opened before eight in the morning, and hermetically sealed on Sunday, with the exception of certain clubs, hotels, and restaurants, which should receive especial licenses for the sale of wine and beer only, to be open during certain specified hours in the afternoon or evening. Fourth, I would permit no bar to be set up unless a certain number of tables and chairs were placed in the same room, and provision made for something to eat, as is made in Germany; and I would permit no flashy displays either inside or outside of any saloon or hotel or club.

The great aim, as it seems to me, of the law and of public opinion should be to make the saloon as respectable as possible, and not to crush it down by restrictions that will not be followed, and that are born of cant and bigotry. Frankly, I cannot understand why, if rich men can have their clubs and places where they can go and meet their fellows socially, poor men should be debarred from the same sort of places. The poor have no money with which to erect

palatial club-houses, and they have no money, if they cannot erect club-houses, to go to the theatre and other fine places of amusement; do not, therefore, let us make their mean places of resort worse than they are. Let us lift them up—let us help to lift them up—and cease to play the hypocrite. Coffee-houses and such like agencies are very good in their way; but I do not believe that there are many whose dainty flesh quivers at the thought of the low saloon who would care to frequent the coffee-houses with their smug air of patronage. The poor man, shut up with a wife, and generally with more children than the rich man is willing to have, in a little narrow house or in a few rooms, must have some place in which he may meet his fellows. All places for the sale of intoxicants at retail are alike in character, and should be regarded alike, and should be considered as alike reputable or disreputable. What is wanted is as much a reform of manners as of the law. Let men—rich men and poor men alike—learn to conduct themselves temperately in all public-houses and clubs. Let them cease to treat and to be treated. Let them sit down and drink something while they are eating, like civilized

men; and not stand up and gulp down a bare drink like a savage. Above all, let them agree, and let them publish this agreement to the world, that for men to drink intoxicants during business hours is a sin, not only against nature and morality, but against common sense and business character.

One last word in conclusion, and I shall finish. Let me say that no laws, no regulations, will do anything of permanence in eradicating evils—the social evil, the low saloon, or any other; such laws and such regulations will serve only to control and restrict them, and they will do this if they are wise and do not run counter to the great rule of common consent. The primary appeal must be made to the heart of every man and woman in the land that they each shall resolve to live the higher and not the lower life; that they each shall endeavor to be brave and true and noble, and not cowardly and false and mean. And the secondary appeal must be made to the masses of men and women collectively that they all shall resolve to live for the social order as well as for themselves; that they all shall determine to give somewhat of their time

and efforts for the common good of humanity, at no matter what sacrifice of self.

And these appeals, need I point out to you, must be based on the one great example of perfect manhood known to men—on the example of Jesus Christ, who partook of the pleasures of life that were innocent, and who denounced those that were wrong; who feasted in the company of His friends, and who fasted alone with His God; who was temperate in all things, and whose temperance did not degenerate into weakness; who did not sacrifice Himself in giving up the things that were right, but in never yielding to the things that were wrong.

XI.

THE CROSS THE RESOLVENT OF DIFFICULTIES.

“But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.”—GAL. vi. 14.

As we go about from place to place, consorting with one or another person, as we pick up here and there a book and read what this or that author has written, we are struck by the fact that a man's opinions depend, as a rule, upon his standpoint, and that this is his point of view of life. These points are: the old Epicurean, that which simply looks upon life as a something that affords so many opportunities for pleasure; the old Stoical, that which regards existence as a dreadful task, and the accidents and incidents of life as so many burdens to be borne; the new utilitarian, that which looks upon life as a something to be used, and all things that come into it as so many ways of getting on; and the religious, that which looks upon life as the gift of God, and all the things of it as so

many means for the development of character. Yes, right here in this congregation, I am sure that I—that any one—could, after a short acquaintance with the people composing it, divide them into the several classes I have named. There would, to be sure, be some that could not be classified—those who are the mere flotsam and jetsam upon the ocean of society; but for the most part, the men and the women who sit before me look either for the pleasures to be had, the burdens to be borne, the things to be utilized, or the ideas and ideals that are God's.

You may read a thousand books, you may converse with a thousand persons, and you will perceive that all sorts of questions are asked as to life, its meaning, its value, its aim, its end; and to these questions all sorts of answers will be given. But all these questions and all the answers thereto, I am sure, will be found to have relation to one or the other of the points of view of life of which I have spoken. And how confusing they are, these questions and answers—the interminable discussions in regard to life and its issues, great and small! How weary we become of them! how helpless in face of them all! The money question, the tariff

question, the tenement question, the labor question, the immigrant question, the agricultural question, the tramp question, the war question, the Afro-American question, the Roman Catholic question, the educational question, the municipal question, the woman question, the geological question, the descent-of-man question, the inspiration-of-Scripture question, the immortality question, and a host of others that need not be named—these and such as these confront us on every side, and they not only ask, but they command, that we shall consider them. We may laugh them in the face and say, “What do I care for you? You are only so many spectres that men have drawn up by the enchantment of their intellects from a limbo as imaginary as that which Shakespeare places behind the scenes of ‘Macbeth.’ I shall enjoy my life in spite of you, and drink of all its pleasures!” Or we may shake our heads and say, “I see you, I cannot help but see you, but, as I cannot solve you, I will bear the burdens you cast upon me as uncomplainingly as I can.” Or we may shut our eyes and ignore them and say, “I do not want to see you, I will not be bothered with you; what I want is to make the best I can out of my

life in the ways that strike men's admiration and are called successful." Or we may say, "I see you, I think of you, I do not wholly understand you, why you and such things as you should be in the conscious life of humanity, yet somehow I feel that you are necessary for the intellectual and moral development of the race. I will try my best to get at your meaning." Yes, yes, whether we laugh or cry or shrug our shoulders or look at these questions with longing to understand them, they and such as they are there; they start up before our eyes on every street, from every newspaper and book that we read.

My friends, I have thought and pondered upon these questions again and again as I wandered the past summer through the older countries of Europe, conversing with men, viewing their works and reading their books; and I confess I have been at times much depressed with my inability to solve them satisfactorily. But more depressed have I been by the thought that I was placed here as a teacher, and that I must have failed to give you any clear light that would make their solution easier for you. Yet in all my perplexity and regret one thing has stood forth in my consciousness—the incarnation of

the Son of God, the crucifixion of the Son of man. The cross of Christ seemed to come nearer and nearer to my eyes and to sink deeper and deeper into my soul, and there grew up in me a conviction—not of the reason I had so often used, but of the faith I had never felt—that the cross is the one thing in all the world that it is necessary for men to know and to understand; that in the knowledge and the understanding of the meaning of Jesus Christ crucified the answers to all the world's hard questions can be given—not fully, perhaps, but sufficiently for the daily needs of the life of mankind.

Yes, I am convinced, as well for myself as for you and all others, that we do not give the proper attention to the central fact of God's revelation of Himself to man in the person of His Son. We let our minds be diverted from the crucifixion—that great tragedy of evil, yet victory of love, that event in which all the interests of the world met, by which all the questions of mankind were answered—and we fix them upon the things that lie in the shadows of Calvary, the things that long ago were put to flight by the outcome of its power. You will understand me when I say I am convinced that the

cross of Christ solved all the questions that had arisen, or that could possibly arise, in the life of mankind; all questions of pain, all of pleasure, all of duty, all of godliness. Now we may think—that is, some of us may think—of this in a general way; but for the most part men are not convinced of this thing at all; and those who are hold their convictions half-heartedly. What we need—what we all need—is to stand before the cross of Christ, not as reasoners, but as believers, and as such to contemplate it quietly, calmly, and be still. Then, and only then, will it strike its roots downward and bear its fruit upward, like all life. It is an old axiom, but as true as it is old, that life, as well the spiritual as the natural, is a matter of growth; and this growth, to be of the highest form and to bear the truest fruit, must be constantly cultivated.

You may say to me, “Do you not aver too much when you say that the cross of Christ is the solvent of every difficulty that can arise in the life of mankind?” No, I do not think so. Take any question; take the general question of pleasure: is it right? Certainly, in cases where no sacrifice of self is demanded; but where any sacrifice of self is demanded it is wrong. But

who shall say when a sacrifice of self is demanded? Jesus Christ. But how? In the life He led that led Him to the cross. Or take a practical question; take the question of the housing of the poor: how should their tenements be erected and arranged? Can we doubt how, when we look at the Saviour on the cross and call to mind the words that He uttered just previous to His passion and death? "In My Father's house there are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you." Surely He did not mean to go to prepare a place simply for those who live in great palatial houses; and if Jesus Christ through His cross and passion went to prepare a place in His Father's house of many mansions for the children of men, how much more ought we to prepare places for them in the many mansions of the cities of the world! "Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!" For these, indeed, there may be found no places in the many mansions of the kingdom of God!

Or take, again, the burning question of the day—the labor question; and of it the most difficult

of all its many subdivisions, the problem of wages. How shall we ascertain what should be the proportion of the wage-worker in the profit of production? Let me say that I have considered this question much and long; I have determined that I would come to some conclusion in regard to it; but I have never been able to do so as I have looked at the question simply from the standpoint of reason. There is the capitalist, and there is the employer, and there are the employees; who can say just what proportion they each should have of the return for the work produced by the efforts of all? We may declare that each should have a fair return; but what is fair? The capitalist says, "I risk a great deal;" the employer says, "I manage the whole affair;" the wage-earner says, "I really produce the result." It is in the cross of Christ alone; it is, I say, in the cross of self-sacrifice alone, that I can see any solution of this most difficult problem. Christ here tells men that they should be willing to sacrifice themselves for the good of their kind. But more: He shows them, as He hangs there and prays for His persecutors, the meaning of the great words He had previously spoken: "Go ye and learn what that meaneth, I

will have mercy, and not sacrifice." It is not so much the hard sacrifice of the Son of man, rather is it the tender mercy of the Son of God, that we perceive when we look long and steadily at Jesus Christ crucified. And so we learn,—and we can learn only in the love that was manifested on the cross of Calvary—the truth we seek: that not that proportion of the return for work done by which men may live is right, but rather that proportion by which men may live as men. When capitalists and employers shall look steadily at the cross of Christ they will not be content to give their employees simply a "living wage"; they will desire to give their brothers manhood wages.

And mark, it is not so much the reasoning faculty that is brought into play by the contemplation of the cross; the mind cannot always explain the belief of the heart, for the heart has reasons of its own that the mind knows not of. In the contemplation of the cross we see its deep significance, and we see that its significance is broader and deeper and higher than all the thought of men, because its height and depth and width are conterminous with the love of Jesus Christ, and His love is the infinite love of the eternal God.

It is in this thought—in this transforming, transcending thought—that one loses one's self in the contemplation of the Crucified; but in the losing of one's self one finds one's self again, for one finds God, and it is the finding of God that gives our lives their true meaning and value. And so I am convinced that during the past three or four generations men have been on the wrong roads—the roads of deism, of positivism, of materialism and agnosticism; they have need to get off and to shun these roads as quickly as possible, and walk in the way of Christ—the way which led Him to the cross. Has He not said, "Follow Me," "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me"? Yet mark again, it is not so much the words of Christ that should be in our hearts and minds, it is the cross itself; and so I am convinced that we have in a measure done wrong, even in the past few years, since we began to study so attentively the Sermon on the Mount and the other discourses of our Lord. Surely we should study them, for they are the life-seeds of the great Sower; but greater than the seeds is the Sower Himself; and greatest is that Sower when He was least in the judgment of wicked men.

It seems strange to me, when I think of the meaning of the cross of Christ, that for so many years after the Reformation it should have been held by so many pious souls to be the greatest emblem of superstition. The revolt against ecclesiasticism must, indeed, have been tremendous, when it protested against the highest and best as well as the lowest and worst forms and representations of the faith! But, thank God! the extreme protest of the Reformed churches is dying out, and with it the change it effected in men's thoughts of religion and religious duty. Calvin and his followers, when they looked away from the cross and the other emblems of the Christian faith, looked into men's hearts; and so they endeavored to establish a rational basis and philosophy of religion. But religion—that is, the revelation of God to man in the person of Christ—though it must square with men's reason and present many points of philosophy, rests upon something far deeper and broader than the thought of man; it rests upon the love of God, which may be comprehended by man's thought, but which can never be compassed by it. It is no wonder, then, that when men's ideas of God and His ways began to grow they quickly felt

that the cardinal points of the Calvinistic system—predestination, effectual calling, final perseverance, and the atonement for the benefit of a limited number of the elect—bound up their intellects as fast and as hard as the shoes of the Chinese the feet of their infant daughters.

The whole recent revolt against religion is, in my opinion, nothing more than a protest against a man-made theory of what religion must be. I am sure that religious feeling has never been deeper and truer than it is to-day. Never have men been more convinced of the being of God, and of the necessity of knowing Him and of taking Him into their lives; never have they sought so persistently to base all their actions as well as thoughts upon the eternal law of love. The constant study of the words of Jesus Christ, and the many books that have recently been written thereupon, is a proof of what I say. But a stronger proof is the vast sums of money that have been given to further every cause of Christian love, the many acts of mercy that have been done in Christ's name. What is needed to-day is this: a teaching that will take men's minds away from thinking of themselves in relation to the Godhead, and reverse their point of view—a

teaching that will make them to look upon God and His Son in relation to men; and nothing will aid this so much as the bringing before their eyes of the wonderful emblem of the cross. Therein we see the unlimited mercy of God; therein we know how He loved the world and mankind. In the bruised figure of Him who was and is "very God of very God, begotten, not made"; who came into our world from His own, and was made man for us; and as such, because He would not answer the foolish questions of men, but showed us the way that leads to the truth which brings with it eternity, was taken by them and nailed on the tree—in this figure, I say, we have all the light that is necessary for us to walk in, which will guide our feet and the feet of all mankind into the way of peace.

Ah! my friends, I beseech you, fix your eyes on the cross of Christ, and let this be your glory: that the Son of God loved you, and gave Himself for you. Then indeed will you learn the way to live well yourselves, then how to live for others; for how can you do otherwise than live worthy of Him who loved you even to the death of the cross? How can you do otherwise than love those for whom Christ died, that He might

save them, as well as you, from the many forms of sin? And let me say that if you can, even as St. Paul, understand the full meaning of the cross, you will quickly learn to sacrifice the things of the world to your love of God and man; quickly will the things of the world learn to sacrifice you—in which sacrifices you shall become even as your Lord, an embodiment of love, and be fit to live in the smile of the Saviour of the world!

XII.

NO VISION, NO PEOPLE.

“Where there is no vision, the people perish.”—PROV. xxix. 18.

ALL the power, all the capacity of man have been reduced by many of the world's best thinkers to strength and clearness of vision. With these gifts, it is averred, the truly able man is potentially able in all directions, no matter what may be the field wherein they are exerted. This power and this capacity manifest themselves in various ways; but chiefly they take two forms, according as the man concerns himself with things temporal or with things spiritual. To many this thought may seem transcendental and foolish; I do not wish to beg the question by saying that these have no vision. Let us see whether the thought is true or not, and let us for the argument's sake take two examples—the example of the building of a house, and the example of the upbuilding of society.

How is it in the building of a house? What

is the first step taken? A plan is drawn by an architect. But does he draw it in a haphazard way? No, he must see the idea before him before he begins his work. He puts it on paper, it is true, but he must be able to see it before he puts it there. He must see the shape, the elevation, the general effect. He puts his idea on paper, but he does this chiefly that there may be no mistakes, and so that others may see his plan. But the architect is not the only person that must see the house before it is erected; not to speak of the owner, there is the builder. The builder must see what the architect sees. He need not see with the same strength and clearness of vision, to be sure, but he must see the house, or else he cannot build it. But the builder has aids and helps to his vision; he has before his eyes the drawing that the architect—a man of stronger and clearer vision—has produced.

And so likewise is it with sub-builders. The master workman assigns to his brethren of the craft—of lesser capacity—certain portions of the building which they can see, which are in the range of their vision. It is only those who have no strength and clearness of insight at all who carry out the work of building foot by foot, day

by day. These can see the building only when it is finished; and happy are they if they can see it then. There are many men who look at a building—a house, a church—who see only bricks and mortar and what they must have cost in time and money. The real beauty of the edifice—its graceful lines, its warmth of color, its use, its aim—is entirely hid from them.

And so let us take the example of the upbuilding of society. Let us look at the work of an economist—and by the work of an economist I mean all the endeavors of those who have wrought upon the structure of society, both those who have essayed to rebuild on the old, as well as those who have essayed to build on new, foundations. And let me say that all the philosophers who have not been occupied simply in regarding the working and development of the intellect—that is, who have not been simple psychologists—come under this head of economists. I mean, all the world's philosophers who have not devoted themselves merely to the study of man's power and capacity have had as an end of their endeavors the upbuilding of society.

Let us see what have been the great forces (humanly speaking) in the construction and re-

construction of society. I do not mean, of course, in the production of wealth and of the means of living; I mean in setting forth the best ways in which men should live and conduct themselves in order that they may attain to their best development. Surely the great forces have been the men who have had aims above the utilitarian and expedient; who saw through the shortcomings of the things that were about them, and looked ahead to others that were broader and better. In other words, the great forces in the progress of civil society have been the men who have had strength and clearness of vision; clearness to see the dangers of the present, strength to urge their brethren to a higher and better way of living. And so it has been: the vision of Plato, the vision of Sir Thomas More, the vision of Rousseau, have been the forces that have opened men's minds to a realizing sense of their own defects; that have made them to look ahead to, to strive for, better things.

I have named the visions of these men as types, for to their clearness and strength of insight we can trace an immense influence in the upbuilding of society all along the lines of history; but there are hundreds of other men of

strong and clear vision who have greatly aided society, not only in their own, but in all the days since they lived; who saw through the phenomena into the reality of things, and reported the reality to us. Not to go too far back, let us speak of the men of modern times. How much do you think the world would have progressed this past century without the aid of the visions of Wilberforce and Carlyle, of Keble and Kingsley, of Gladstone and Tennyson, in England; of Guizot and Hugo, of Lamartine and Thiers, of Dupanloup and Gambetta, in France; of Webster and Seward, of Lowell and Phillips, of Lincoln and Grant, in the United States? A moment's reflection will show you that neither the social nor the political advancement of our century has owed anything to the men who have concerned themselves simply with the production of material things, but that it owes everything to the wisdom of the men of vision. They have furnished all the best theories of government and society. They have settled the principles of legislation and taxation, the ways of production and distribution, the laws of war and of international comity, the aim of the state, and the best way to secure the accomplishment of that

aim in all its manifold forms. And why has this been so? I think we can say because these and such as these were able to see through the things that surrounded them—to see on to a higher and better way of living; and because, too, they were able not only to see, but to make others to see what they saw. And so can we not say that it is literally true that “where there is no vision, the people perish”? An existing state of affairs, with all the abuses which creep into it through man’s egoism and self-seeking, would become intolerable unless there were some who could always see out of it a way to a more perfect state.

And as it has been in the past so is it in the present. On all sides men are arising and denouncing the shortcomings of the social and political life of the day. Never before have so many things which seemed so satisfactory to the prosperous and negligent been banned and anathematized. We would almost think, when we read the indictments drawn by thinking men and women against this evil and that, when we hear the reproaches hurled by them against one political party or the other, that every custom and institution of life had fallen into decay and

chaos; but a little reflection teaches us that the contrary is true. Decay is a mark of a lack of activity, chaos of a lack of thought; and activity and thought are the distinguishing marks of our times. No, no; we hear and read of the shortcomings of the day because of the fact that there are men and women—ever more and more of them—who are beginning to look at things steadily and squarely, and who in so looking see when they are wrong. Some there are, indeed, who can only see when things are wrong; but others there are who cannot only see when things are wrong, but how they can be made right. Both the one class and the other do good; but those who can see both when things are wrong and how to make them right have the strength and clearness of vision that stamp them as the benefactors of the race. It has been always so. It was so right here in our own country not many years ago; it will be so again. The denunciators of the day are like those who denounced the great evil of horrid slavery and the things it bred in its festering sores. Each one did good work in arousing the moral sense of the nation; but they who did the best were those who looked beyond the institution of slavery to a realiza-

tion of the brotherhood of man under a better appreciation of the fatherhood of God.

The evil of the condition of the masses to-day is analogous to that of the slaves. On all sides the rich are denounced, many rightly, some wrongly; for to-day it is the same as it was in slaveholding times: many rich men sympathize with the low condition of the poor, and try to help them. Some men are coming, some have come, to the front who will be able to see through all our present errors and confusions on to a better state of things, on to a further realization of the brotherhood of man in the kingdom of a wise and loving Father. To their eyes has come, or will come, such a vision as came to the eyes of the men and women of a generation ago, when one arose and prophesied:

“Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord:

He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath
are stored;

He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.”

But there are other ways than those I have mentioned in which people would perish if there were no vision. Man is a mixed creature. He does not “live by bread alone”; he will not, he cannot be content simply by being fed and

groomed like sleek oxen in the stalls. He desires things that entertain him, as well as feed and clothe. The building of a house and the up-building of society, as important as they are, are not sufficient for him. A social being, made for the enjoyment of intercourse with his fellows, he demands the things that make for, that make up, the social side of life. He must have music and painting, poetry and knowledge. It may seem strange to speak of a musician as of one that has a vision; but surely it is necessary that a composer should see into the harmony of his theme; otherwise what he produces will be simply a jingle of notes, a tune that will end in fatiguing the ears of men. And so of painting; we might think that this would require, not insight, but sight; but unless the painter can see beyond and behind his objects, unless he can see through them to the eternal ideal beyond, his paintings are but copies. The vision of the poet is easy to understand; every work of his tells us of his visions. The poet is a creator, a maker of bright ideals and forms that lead our minds away from the dull clods beneath our feet into the realms of loveliness and perfection. Unless the poet could tell us what he saw we should see nothing.

What shall I say of the vision that is requisite to knowledge? "Surely," the unthoughtful will say, "no vision is necessary to the scientific man." Well, I cannot pretend to speak as an authority; but when the apostle of the sciences, Professor Tyndall, wrote upon the use of the imagination in the development of science, we can see how necessary clearness and strength of vision are for the right acquisition of knowledge. Indeed, a moment's reflection will show us their necessity. The imagination must first catch at the truth before the experiments of the naturalist can come in to demonstrate it. Unless men can see behind what they read, they read but words.

But as yet I have only touched upon my subject. Man does not live by bread alone, nor by the arts and sciences, "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." His vision is contented neither with the tangible nor with the intangible objects and interests of the world; he will look far above and beyond them all into infinity; he would behold the Creator of the things which he sees and imagines that he sees—he would see God, and he would see God ruling in heaven. And so it has come about that God has vouchsafed to man visions of Himself

and of His rule. But no man has seen God as He is; aye, not even great Moses saw Him wholly. "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then we shall see Him face to face: for now we know in part; but then shall we know Him even as also we are known." Yet God has vouchsafed to man visions of Himself and of His rule in an especial way—in the way of His only begotten Son, through the veil of the Incarnation. By this great and wonderful likeness, through the perfect humanity of Christ, can we see God, and know Him as He is, and know, too, how He reigns.

And thus it was that, by glimpses of this great revelation to be, the prophets of old times, who saw through the phenomena of the things of time, when they told men what they saw of and how they saw the Godhead, foretold them of the Christ—they prophesied of Him. You see what I mean: when God revealed His glory to Moses He covered him with His hand, and he saw but His "back parts"—that is, he saw but the things that were non-essential and secondary. It is true that Isaiah tells us that he saw "the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple." But this vision of

Isaiah, we perceive when we examine it, was but the spiritualization of the temple of Jerusalem. He saw the earthly temple reflected on high in a vision, in which the Shechinah became the triune God seated on His throne. But neither Moses nor Isaiah could tell us what it was they saw of God, even as the Son Himself has told us, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." The prophets of old, I say, saw God, and prophesied of Him, only in the person of His Son. They told the people that they should see "the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in His wings"; that "their eyes should see the King in His beauty: that they should behold the land that is very far off." Ah, what a vision of beauty, of righteousness, of love, did these holy men give us of God, in the person of His Son! The vision is all one, but we can divide it into many rays. Let us for our convenience divide it into the three of which I have spoken. Let us look at the vision of our blessed Lord in beauty, in righteousness, and in love.

And first of the vision of beauty: it is to be remarked that the vision of beauty is the uni-

versal one, and that it underlies all others. The vision of those who turned their eyes to the external world, to the arts, and to knowledge, soon showed mankind that there was nothing in the world that was perfect. Their experiments showed them, also, that they could not make anything that was perfect—neither a stone pyramid, nor a wise goddess, nor a perfect social order; that there would always be some defect, some flaw, in their creations. And so they tried to see into the future, and longed for the time when some one should come who would embody in himself this great craving of the soul for the beauty of perfection; whose way and word and character would be a pattern by which men should walk and think and live, by which all the rough and squalid places of the world should be made clean and smooth and even. And thus it was that they foretold of such an one to come. We have their prophecies recorded in all history, both in sacred and in profane. The poems of Virgil, the oracles of Buddha, the psalms of David, all tell us of the perfect King to be. All made men to see the Beautiful One who was at once the despair and the hope of mankind.

But to the people of Israel alone was vouch-

safed by God a vision of righteousness. Indeed, apart from Israel, righteousness was unknown to the ancient world. I do not mean to say that the ancients had no idea of justice; but of justice that was just and true universally, they had none. Neither had they any idea of justice tempered with mercy, nor of that mercy that makes for peace, which leads men to holiness, "without which no man shall see the Lord." How wonderful is the vision of Israel! "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven." And again, "The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever." And again, "And this is His name whereby He [that shall come] shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness."

And thus it came about that as the holy men of old saw clearer and clearer into the righteousness of God, they saw visions of His love; they saw those traits of the Son of God that make us to approach Him with reverence and with fear, yet with trust and with hope. I mean they saw the humility, the patience, the long-suffering, the

gentleness of our Lord, and told us of them. And this is the heart of Christianity. What would it all amount to—the agony, the bloody sweat, the cross, the passion of Christ—if we did not see, even as the prophets saw, “searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify,” that these things were suffered for us through God’s love, that we might see and know God, and understand His rule and dominion? Ah, beloved, if we should see but a fanatic and an enthusiast in Jesus of Nazareth, and not Him “who in His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree,” and not Him “who went about doing good,” and who “preached the gospel to the poor,” then would we be of all men most miserable! Then would there be no vision of beauty and righteousness and love in all the world, but only of sin and wrong and suffering. Then would all our aspirations for better things, all our endeavors to build up society in better ways, be vain, and we but as phantoms thrown against a blind wall. For Christ is the Light of the world, and to Him alone must we go for light on the questions of the day, even as men have gone to Him for light on the questions of the days that are passed. Without His light we

would be blind to the shortcomings of our times. We would see no ways by which we could change them and make ready a place for the oncoming of the things of better promise.

On the other hand, if we can look upon the face of the Son of God and see in it all that the prophets foretold, all that the apostles told, we are of men most happy; for we will not only see how great and comprehensive is God's love toward us, and what it is that He wills for us on earth; we will have some idea, also, of the "things which He hath prepared for those who love Him" in heaven. Happy, yea, blessed is the man if the vision of the love of God shall open to him as he shall

"Gaze one moment on the Face whose beauty
Wakes the world's great hymn;
Feel it one unutterable moment
Bent in love o'er him;
In that look feel heaven, earth, men, and angels
Distant grow and dim;
In that look feel heaven, earth, men, and angels
Nearer grow through Him."

And so the vision of love expands; and we have a glimpse of the wonderful extent of it in the great revelation before which the beloved disciple fell as one that was dead. How transcen-

dent is the vision of St. John of the new heaven and the new earth; of the great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God!

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the Holy City, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.”

“And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.”

Beloved, let us pray that we may have the capacity to see and to know these things that we ought to see and to know, so that we may be able to be good and to make others good in our generation ; so that we may be able to help on the race of mankind to the attainment of the good "things which God hath prepared for those who love Him."

HN
31
P75

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 864 076 5

